The development of a multidimensional measure of post-deployment reintegration: Initial psychometric analyses & descriptive results

Final report to Director General Health Services Quality of Life research grant

Ann-Renée Blais
Megan M. Thompson
Angela Febbraro
Donna Pickering
Don McCreary

Defence R&D Canada – Toronto

Technical Report
DRDC Toronto TR 2003-142
December 2003

Author

Ann-Renée Blais

Approved by

Ross Pigeau
Head, Command Effectiveness and Behaviour Section

Approved for release by

K.M. Sutton
Chair, Document Review and Library Committee

© Her Majesty the Queen as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2003
© Sa majesté la reine, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2003

104-07460/

Abstract

Returning home from overseas military service typically occurs within 24 hours. This abrupt return to "normal" roles and activities can be a significant stressor. To date, most information on the effects of post-deployment reintegration comes from American Vietnam War veterans suffering from PTSD, recalling their experiences years later. The present research is the first to develop a theoretically based, multidimensional, measure of post-deployment reintegration that reflects the experience of Canadian Forces soldiers. The measure, based on a review of the literature and discussions with CF personnel who have deployed, was constructed to reflect positive and negative aspects of four theoretical dimensions of reintegration: personal, family, occupational, and cultural reintegration. Three hundred and seventy-four CF veterans of Op Apollo in Afghanistan completed the initial Reintegration Survey. Exploratory factor analyses revealed both positive and negative aspects of the four dimensions of post-deployment reintegration. Overall, soldiers reported more positive than negative reintegration experiences. The most positive scores were associated with family and cultural reintegration, and the most negative scores were associated with work experiences. Some demographic group differences were associated with marital status, dependants, occupational group, and number of previous deployments.

Résumé

Le retour au pays après un service militaire accompli outre-mer se fait généralement en l'espace de 24 heures. Ce retour abrupt à la vie « normale » peut engendrer énormément de stress. Jusqu'ici, toutefois, la plupart des renseignements sur les effets de cette réintégration ont été obtenus auprès d'anciens combattants américains de la Guerre du Vietnam à qui l'on a demandé, des années plus tard, de se rappeler leur expérience du retour au pays. L'étude dont il est question ici est la première à avoir pour objet de mettre au point une mesure théorique et pluridimensionnelle de la réintégration postdéploiement, qui tiendrait compte de l'expérience des membres des Forces canadiennes. La mesure, fondée sur une analyse de la littérature et sur des discussions tenues avec des membres des FC ayant été déployés outre-mer, a été conçue de manière à rendre compte des aspects tant positifs que négatifs des quatre dimensions théoriques de la réintégration, soit les aspects personnel, familial, professionnel et culturel. Trois cent soixante-quatorze anciens combattants des FC ayant pris part à l'opération *Apollo* en Afghanistan ont répondu à la première version de l'enquête sur la réintégration. Les analyses des facteurs étudiés ont révélé que les quatre dimensions de la réintégration postdéploiement comportaient des aspects tant positifs que négatifs. Dans l'ensemble, les expériences positives signalées par les soldats l'emportaient sur les expériences négatives. Les scores positifs étaient surtout associés à la réintégration familiale et culturelle, et les scores négatifs, à la réintégration professionnelle. Certaines différences constatées entre les groupes étudiés étaient associées à l'état matrimonial, à la présence de personnes à charge, au groupe professionnel et au nombre de déploiements antérieurs.

This page intentionally left blank.

Executive summary

Background

Advances in modern technology mean that returning from overseas military service typically involves a very rapid return home, allowing very little time for psychological decompression from the tour. This abrupt return to 'normal' roles and activities at personal, family, and organizational levels, can be a significant stressor. The consequences of poor post-deployment reintegration and adjustment may be wide-ranging and have considerable long-term consequences for both returning soldiers and their families.

To date, however, most information on the effects of this post-deployment reintegration experience is from American Vietnam War veterans who were asked to recall their homecoming experiences years after they have returned. There is relatively little systematic information about these reintegration experiences from Canadian Forces personnel.

Thus, the primary purpose of the study was to develop a theoretically based, multidimensional, measure of post-deployment reintegration that reflected the experience of Canadian Forces soldiers.

After a review of the literature and conducting our own focus group research with CF personnel, we developed several items tapping four major areas or themes related to post-deployment reintegration:

a. personal reintegration, e.g., "feeling like oneself again"

b. family reintegration, e.g., "feeling like a part of the family again"

c. occupational reintegration, e.g., "adjusting back to garrison life, with its restrictions and bureaucracy"

&

d. cultural reintegration, e.g., "adjusting from settings of extreme deprivation into a land of the 'haves'"

As well, past research has tended to focus almost exclusively on negative experiences associated with deployments. However, some recent research has suggested that participation in overseas deployments can also be a positive experience for soldiers. Therefore, we wanted to ensure that our new measure also reflected this orientation. That is, we wanted to include items that reflected both positive and negative reintegration experiences.

These considerations and the review of the literature led to the development of an initial set of 64 positive and negative items tapping aspects of personal family, occupational and cultural post-deployment reintegration. Approximately equal numbers of items were positively and negatively worded, and reflected each of the four reintegration themes.

Respondents

Three hundred and seventy-four soldiers from LFWA (CFB's Winnipeg, Shilo & Edmonton) who had deployed to Afghanistan on Op Apollo completed the initial version of the Reintegration Survey.

Procedure

Members of DRDC Toronto's Stress & Coping Group travelled to the bases and conducted the survey sessions in conjunction with the base Personnel Selection Officers, who were administering surveys for the Directorate of Human Resource Research & Evaluation's (DHRRE) Human Dimensions of Operations (HDO) Project. DHRRE requested that the HDO data be kept separate, and so those results will not be presented here and are be available separately from DHRRE.

Results

Our initial analyses sought to refine the reintegration measure, specifically eliminating items that did not accurately reflect the post-deployment reintegration experiences of these soldiers, and the identification of those items that required rewording. This led to the elimination of five items and to the rewording of several further items. The following statistical results are based on the 55 "best" items of the initial version of the reintegration measure.

Analyses supported our hypothesis concerning the presence of positive and negative aspects of the four overall dimensions post-deployment reintegration. Thus, soldiers reported having positive and negative experiences associated with personal, professional, family and cultural aspects of post-deployment reintegration. For instance, soldiers reported some readjustment issues with respect to returning home, but also indicated that overall they felt quite close to their families.

Overall results show that these soldiers reported more positive than negative reintegration experiences. That is, average scores were higher on the reintegration survey items associated with positive experiences, rather than negative experiences, and this was true across all aspects of reintegration, except for work and occupational reintegration. The highest mean scores reflected positive family and cultural reintegration experiences. The lowest ratings for positive reintegration experiences were associated with post-deployment work roles. Similarly, these soldiers felt most negative about negative work experiences and least negative about personal difficulties associated with reintegration.

We also completed preliminary analyses to see if there were group differences for soldiers in terms of these areas of post-deployment reintegration. We selected the demographic groups to be investigated based on theoretical considerations, as well as on the sample sizes of the group. For instance, so few officers completed the Reintegration Survey that is would have been difficult to make a valid statement about differences in reintegration issues based on rank.

Based on these theoretical and group size criteria, we investigated the following demographic group differences: marital status (two groups: married vs. single soldiers), children (two groups: no children vs. one or more children), occupation (two groups: combat vs. support or administrative soldiers), and number of previous deployments (three groups: one vs. two vs. three or more deployments).

Marital Status: Married soldiers indicated significantly more positive and negative experiences related to family issues than did single soldiers. Single soldiers reported significantly more positive and negative experiences related to work issues than did married soldiers.

Children: Soldiers with children (i.e., one or more dependants) also endorsed significantly more positive and negative aspects associated with family reintegration than did soldiers without dependents.

Military Occupation: Individuals in the combat arms occupations were significantly more likely to endorse items reflecting the negative aspects of post-deployment work roles. Combat soldiers did not differ from administrative or support roles in terms of survey items associated with positive work reintegration. Moreover, soldiers in the combat arms indicated positive or negative personal, family, and cultural reintegration levels that were equal to those reported by soldiers who had served in administrative or support roles in Op Apollo.

Number of Previous Tours: With respect to total number of tours, the only significant group differences we found were between those soldiers who deployed for the first time on Op Apollo ("novices"), versus soldiers who had deployed three or more times. Interestingly, soldiers deploying for the first time indicated higher levels of both positive and negative experiences related to work and to cultural reintegration than did soldiers who had previously deployed three or more times.

Beyond these analyses, each of the fifty-five retained items were reviewed with a subject matter expert and refined in terms of content, and clarity. Several items were reworded, and further items tapping important aspects of reintegration were developed and added for the next round of scale refinement.

Discussion

Overall, these results suggest that, on average, the soldiers who responded to the questionnaire reported relatively high levels of positive reintegration experiences and fairly low levels of negative reintegration experiences.

We did see evidence of group differences on some of these reintegration dimensions for soldiers, and these differences were associated with marital status, dependents, occupational group, and number of previous deployments. Please note that these group differences are preliminary results of the initial version of this measure. Hence, these results should be interpreted with caution and need to be replicated.

It is important to remember that these data were collected approximately nine months after soldiers returned from OP Apollo, arguably very late in the post-deployment reintegration

process. It may be that most negative reintegration issues these soldiers encountered had been dealt with in the intervening months since their return from Afghanistan. This may account for the relatively low levels of negative post-deployment experiences seen here. Results may differ if the survey had been administered two to four months after soldiers had returned from their deployment, when reintegration issues may have been more acute and more salient for them.

It should also be noted that these soldiers had taken part in a three-day stopover in Guam that was specifically ordered by the commanding officer to assist soldiers in "winding down" from and dealing with the intensity of the tour. This opportunity may well have facilitated post-deployment reintegration for these soldiers.

Conclusions

In general, the present findings are quite encouraging in terms of the relatively high levels of positive experiences and the low levels of negative experiences these soldiers endorsed concerning personal, family, and cultural post-deployment reintegration. The highest mean scores for the positive aspects of post-deployment reintegration were related to the family and cultural experiences. The highest mean scores associated with the negative aspects of post-deployment reintegration were related to occupational issues. This may suggest that work continues to be an issue for soldiers who have returned from a high intensity deployment such as Op Apollo, often because their post-deployment work seems to be less challenging and meaningful to them.

Further, these preliminary findings are quite encouraging in terms of the scale development aims of this project. Soldiers demonstrated the presence of the dimensions or themes we had expected to be integral to post-deployment reintegration. They also supported our expectation that there are positive and negative aspects associated with reintegration. Each of these eight scales assessing post-deployment reintegration yielded good levels of reliability. The continued development of a reliable and valid measure of reintegration reflecting the experiences of CF soldiers will be extremely valuable in future research exploring those factors that affect and improve reintegration after overseas deployments.

Finally, we want to thank those soldiers who completed the initial version of the Reintegration measure and provided thoughtful recommendations for scale and item refinement. Their assistance provided us with invaluable information that will be used to refine the reintegration survey for future use with Canadian Forces personnel. We are indebted to them for their time and their assistance on this project.

Blais, A. -R., Thompson, M. M., Febbraro, A., Pickering, D., and McCreary, D. (2003). The development of a multidimensional measure of post deployment reintegration: Initial psychometric analyses & descriptive results. DRDC Toronto TR 2003-142. Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

Sommaire

Contexte

En raison des progrès de la technologie moderne, le retour à la maison du militaire ayant pris part à une opération à l'étranger se fait généralement très rapidement, ce qui lui laisse peu de temps pour décompresser. Ce retour abrupt à la vie normale, sur les plans personnel, familial et organisationnel, peut engendrer énormément de stress. Une réintégration et une réadaptation non réussies après un déploiement peuvent avoir des répercussions importantes et durables tant sur le militaire que sur sa famille.

Jusqu'ici, toutefois, la plupart des renseignements sur les effets de cette réintégration ont été obtenus auprès d'anciens combattants américains de la Guerre du Vietnam à qui l'on a demandé, des années plus tard, de se rappeler leur expérience du retour au pays. Les éléments d'information systématiquement recueillis à ce propos auprès de membres des Forces canadiennes sont relativement rares.

Ainsi, l'étude visait principalement à mettre au point une mesure théorique et pluridimensionnelle de la réintégration postdéploiement, qui tiendrait compte de l'expérience des membres des Forces canadiennes.

Au terme d'une analyse de la littérature et d'une recherche réalisée auprès d'un groupe de réflexion composé de membres du personnel des FC, nous avons dégagé plusieurs questions qui recouvrent quatre grands thèmes liés à la réintégration postdéploiement :

a. la réintégration personnelle, p. ex. l' « impression de redevenir soi-même »

b. la réintégration familiale, p. ex. l'« impression de retrouver sa place au sein de la famille »

c. la réintégration professionnelle, p. ex. la « réadaptation à la vie dans une garnison, avec ses contraintes et ses exigences bureaucratiques »

d. la réintégration culturelle, p. ex. l'« adaptation à un pays de nantis après un séjour dans des pays extrêmement démunis ».

De plus, de manière générale, les recherches réalisées à ce jour ont mis presque exclusivement l'accent sur les expériences négatives associées aux déploiements. Or, il ressort de certaines recherches plus récentes que la participation à des déploiements à l'étranger peut aussi s'avérer une expérience positive pour le soldat. C'est pourquoi nous avons voulu faire en sorte que cette orientation soit intégrée à notre nouvelle mesure. Autrement dit, nous avons cherché à inclure dans notre mesure des éléments qui renvoyaient à des expériences de réintégration tant positives que négatives.

Ces considérations, et l'analyse de la littérature, ont débouché sur l'établissement d'une première série de 64 éléments positifs et négatifs touchant aux aspects personnels, familiaux,

professionnels et culturels de la réintégration postdéploiement. Nous avons prévu un nombre presque égal d'éléments à connotation positive et à connotation négative, qui relevaient des quatre grands thèmes de la réintégration.

Répondants

Trois cent soixante-quatorze soldats du secteur de l'Ouest de la Force terrestre (BFC de Winnipeg, Shilo et Edmonton) ayant été déployés en Afghanistan dans le cadre de l'opération *Apollo* ont répondu à la première version de l'enquête sur la réintégration.

Démarche

Les membres du groupe du stress et des stratégies d'adaptation de RDDC de Toronto se sont rendus dans les bases et tenu des séances d'enquête conjointement avec les officiers de sélection du personnel des bases, qui menaient les enquêtes dans le cadre du projet Dimension humaine des opérations (DHO) de Recherche et évaluation en ressources humaines (RERH). RERH a demandé que les données concernant la DHO soient tenues séparément. Aussi, ces résultats ne seront pas présentés ici, et on peut y avoir accès en s'adressant à RERH.

Résultats

Nos premières analyses visaient à peaufiner la mesure de la réintégration, plus particulièrement à en éliminer des éléments qui ne rendaient pas compte exactement des expériences de la réintégration après un déploiement de ces soldats, et à déterminer quels étaient les éléments qui devaient être reformulés. Cet exercice a eu pour effet d'éliminer cinq éléments et d'en reformuler quelques autres. Les résultats statistiques suivants sont fondés sur les 55 « meilleurs » éléments de la première version de la mesure de la réintégration.

Les analyses des données recueillies ont confirmé notre hypothèse de départ, à savoir que les quatre grandes dimensions de la réintégration postdéploiement comportaient des aspects tant positifs que négatifs. Ainsi, les soldats ont associé des expériences aussi bien positives que négatives aux aspects personnel, professionnel, familial et culturel de leur réintégration. Par exemple, ils ont déclaré avoir éprouvé certains problèmes de réadaptation lors de leur retour au foyer, mais ont indiqué par ailleurs que, dans l'ensemble, ils se sentaient aussi assez proches de leur famille.

Il ressort de manière générale que les expériences positives étaient plus nombreuses que les expériences négatives. Autrement dit, les scores moyens étaient plus élevés à l'égard des éléments de l'enquête associés aux expériences positives qu'à l'égard de ceux qui renvoyaient aux expériences négatives. Cette remarque était vraie pour tous les aspects de la réintégration, sauf l'aspect professionnel. Les scores moyens les plus élevés s'appliquaient à l'aspect positif des expériences de la réintégration familiale et culturelle. Les scores les plus faibles applicables aux expériences positives renvoyaient aux fonctions professionnelles remplies

après le déploiement. De même, ces soldats affichaient l'attitude la plus négative à l'égard des expériences de travail insatisfaisantes et l'attitude la moins négative à l'égard des difficultés personnelles liées à la réintégration.

Nous avons également réalisé des analyses préliminaires afin de déterminer s'il existait, d'un groupe à l'autre, des différences chez ces soldats en ce qui concerne ces aspects de la réintégration postdéploiement. Nous avons sélectionné les groupes de population à étudier à la lumière de considérations théoriques, et en tenant compte de la taille de l'échantillon. Ainsi, les officiers étaient si peu nombreux à répondre à l'enquête sur la réintégration qu'il eût été difficile de tirer des conclusions valides au sujet des différences fondées sur le rang.

À partir de ces critères d'ordre théorique et liés à la taille de l'échantillon, nous avons procédé à une enquête en vue de connaître les différences entre les groupes de population, sur les plans suivants : état matrimonial (deux groupes : soldats mariés contre soldats célibataires), enfants (deux groupes : soldats sans enfant contre soldats ayant un enfant ou plus), activité professionnelle (deux groupes : combattants contre membres du personnel administratif ou de soutien) et nombre de déploiements antérieurs (trois groupes : un, deux ou trois déploiements ou plus).

État matrimonial : Les expériences négatives et positives associées à la réintégration familiale étaient sensiblement plus nombreuses chez les soldats mariés que chez les célibataires. En revanche, par rapport aux soldats mariés, les célibataires ont déclaré avoir vécu beaucoup plus d'expériences positives et négatives associées à la réintégration professionnelle.

Enfants : Les aspects positifs et négatifs de la réintégration familiale étaient aussi sensiblement plus nombreux chez les soldats ayant des enfants (au moins une personne à charge) que chez ceux qui n'en avaient pas.

Groupe professionnel militaire : Les combattants étaient généralement plus nombreux à souscrire à des éléments qui traduisaient les aspects négatifs des activités professionnelles exercées après un déploiement. En ce qui concerne les éléments du questionnaire qui renvoyaient à une réintégration professionnelle positive, on n'a observé aucune différence entre les combattants et les militaires occupant des fonctions administratives ou de soutien. De plus, la somme d'expériences positives ou négatives associées à la réintégration personnelle, familiale et culturelle était égale chez les combattants et chez les militaires ayant occupé des fonctions administratives ou de soutien dans le cadre de l'opération *Apollo*.

Nombre de déploiements antérieurs : En ce qui a trait au nombre total de déploiements, les seules différences importantes ont été constatées entre les soldats ayant été déployés pour la première fois dans le cadre de l'opération *Apollo* (les « novices ») et les soldats ayant déjà connu trois déploiements ou plus. Fait intéressant, la somme d'expériences tant positives que négatives associées à la réintégration professionnelle et culturelle était plus élevée chez les militaires qui n'en étaient qu'à leur premier déploiement que chez ceux qui avaient déjà été déployés trois fois ou plus.

Au-delà de ces analyses, chacun des cinquante-cinq éléments retenus a été revu, sur les plans du contenu et de la clarté, par un expert en la matière. Plusieurs éléments ont été reformulés,

et d'autres éléments qui renvoyaient à des aspects importants de la réintégration ont été mis au point et ajoutés à la liste, qui devait être soumise à un autre exercice de révision.

Analyse

Dans l'ensemble, d'après les réponses données par les soldats au questionnaire, la somme d'expériences positives liées à la réintégration était relativement élevée et la somme d'expériences négatives, relativement faible.

Nous avons observé des différences, d'un groupe à l'autre, à l'égard de certains aspects de la réintégration, différences qui étaient associées à l'état matrimonial, à la présence de personnes à charge, au groupe professionnel et au nombre de déploiements antérieurs. Il importe de signaler que ces différences ont été mises en évidence par les résultats préliminaires de la première version de cette mesure. Autrement dit, ces résultats doivent être interprétés avec prudence, et l'exercice doit être reproduit.

Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que ces données ont été recueillies environ neuf mois après le retour au pays des soldats ayant pris part à l'opération Apollo, ce qui est sans doute une étape très tardive dans le processus de réintégration postdéploiement. Il est possible que la plupart des aspects négatifs de la réintégration avaient déjà été surmontés dans les mois qui ont suivi leur retour d'Afghanistan, ce qui peut expliquer que la somme d'expériences négatives observée ici soit relativement faible. Les résultats auraient peut-être été différents si l'enquête avait été menée de deux à quatre mois après le retour au pays des soldats, à une période où, sans doute, les questions de réintégration étaient plus présentes et se sont posées de manière plus aiguë.

Il importe également de signaler que ces soldats avaient fait une escale de trois jours à Guam, à la demande du commandant, qui voulait les aider à décompresser et à se remettre de l'intensité des expériences vécues lors du déploiement. Cette étape pourrait bien avoir facilité leur réintégration postdéploiement.

Conclusions

De manière générale, les constats actuels sont assez encourageants, dans la mesure où ils indiquent que ces soldats ont vécu une somme d'expériences positives relativement élevée et d'expériences négatives relativement faible dans le cadre de leur réintégration personnelle, familiale et culturelle, après leur déploiement. Les scores moyens les plus élevés à l'égard des aspects positifs de la réintégration concernaient les expériences familiales et culturelles. Dans le cas des aspects négatifs, les scores moyens les plus élevés avaient trait à la vie professionnelle. On pourrait donc en conclure que les activités professionnelles demeurent un problème pour les soldats ayant pris part à un déploiement aussi intense que l'opération Apollo, ce qui, dans bien des cas, tient au fait que les fonctions exercées après le déploiement leur semblent moins stimulantes et moins utiles.

Ces résultats préliminaires sont aussi intéressants dans l'optique de l'un des objectifs du projet, à savoir la mise au point d'échelles d'évaluation. En effet, les réponses données par les soldats révèlent la présence des dimensions ou des thèmes qui, selon nous, faisaient partie

intégrante de la réintégration postdéploiement. Elles ont aussi confirmé notre hypothèse, selon laquelle la réintégration comportait des aspects tant positifs que négatifs. Le degré de fiabilité de chacune de ces huit échelles d'évaluation de la réintégration postdéploiement s'est avéré satisfaisant. Il sera extrêmement utile de poursuivre les travaux d'élaboration d'une mesure fiable et valide de la réintégration adaptée aux expériences des soldats des FC en prévision des recherches à venir sur les facteurs qui ont une incidence sur la réintégration après un déploiement outre-mer, et qui l'améliorent.

Enfin, nous tenons à remercier les soldats qui ont répondu à la première version du questionnaire sur la réintégration et qui nous ont fait des recommandations pertinentes sur la façon d'améliorer l'échelle et les éléments. Leur contribution nous a permis de recueillir des éléments d'information extrêmement précieux qui serviront à peaufiner l'enquête sur la réintégration, destinée aux membres des Forces canadiennes. Nous leur sommes reconnaissants du temps et des efforts qu'ils ont consacrés à ce projet.

Blais, A. -R., Thompson, M. M., Febbraro, A., Pickering, D., and McCreary, D. (2003). The development of a multidimensional measure of post deployment reintegration: Initial psychometric analyses & descriptive results. DRDC Toronto TR 2003-142. Defence R&D Canada – Toronto.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of contents

Abstract i

Résumé i

Executive summary iii

Sommaire vii

Table of contents xiii

List of tables xv

Acknowledgements xvi

Introduction 1

The development of a multidimensional measure of post-deployment reintegration 2

Method 5

Participants 5

Procedure 5

Material: The post-deployment reintegration questionnaire 6

Results 7

Overview 7

Exploratory Factor Analyses 7

Two-factor solution: Positive and negative reintegration experiences 8

Four-factor solution: Personal, family, occupational, and cultural reintegration experiences 8

Eight-factor solution: Positive and negative experiences associated with personal, family, occupational, and cultural reintegration 9

Item analysis 9

Item refinement 9

Preliminary descriptive statistics 10

Demographic group differences 12

Discussion 15

References 33

Annex A: Postdeployment Reintegration Survey – Version 1 35

Annex B: Revised Reintegration Measure – Version 2 43

List of tables

Table 1. Demographic Breakdown of Soldiers Completing Reintegration Questionnaire..... 18

Table 2: Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Two-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)..... 19

Table 3: Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Four-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)..... 21

Table 4: Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Eight-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)..... 24

Table 5: Reliability Analysis of Retained Reintegration Items (N = 374) 28

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities for the Reintegration Subscales with Five Items Deleted (N = 374)..... 31

Acknowledgements

This research was supported with a Director Quality of Life grant from Director General Health Services.

Our thanks go to BGen Fenton for his support of this research project, to Major Jon Gri for co-ordination of the project within LFWA. Our thanks also to Capt Karen Brown for her work on this project, and to LCdr Chris Lyon and Major Brian Goutouski for their valuable assistance in running the research sessions. We also wish to thank LCol Peter Lomasney, Capt. Percy Purpura, and PO2 Margaret Lever for the considered assistance as our subject matter experts.

Our thanks also to Andrea Hawton, Elaine Maceda, and Wendy Sullivan-Kwantes for their work inputting the data and formatting the tables.

Finally, and most particularly, our thanks go to the soldiers of LFWA for their time and assistance completing this questionnaire. They provided us with invaluable information that will be used to refine the reintegration survey for future use with Canadian Forces personnel.

Introduction

Participation in military operations, including operations other than war, can result in a variety of profound negative outcomes [1] including Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), depression, bipolar disorder, panic disorder, obsessive-compulsiveness, and social phobia [2; 3]. Nor are these effects transient in nature: the literature shows that psychological distress consequent to deployment has been clearly evident in veterans from six months to decades after a deployment [4; 5; 6; 7].

In trying to understand the causes of post-deployment adjustment problems, most research has understandably focused on the traumatic events experienced during deployments, such as witnessing torture and death, uncovering mass graves, etc. However, other research shows that a soldier's homecoming experiences are important in ameliorating or impairing both short and long-term adaptation (e.g., [5; 8; 7]. For instance, participants in a focus group study of Canadian Forces personnel indicated that it took an average of approximately four months to readjust to in-garrison life – if the tour had been routine [9]. At least one further study has shown that homecoming stress, in particular feelings of psychological isolation and feeling disconnected, is the most significant predictor of PTSD, even after the effects of combat exposure (see also Fontana & Rosenheck, [5]), earlier trauma, and present stressful life events were accounted for; predicting 43 percent of the variance in subsequent PTSD symptomology [7].

Various factors can increase the stress associated with a soldier's homecoming. Advances in modern technology means that returning from overseas military service typically involves rapid return transportation home, allowing very little time for psychological decompression or reintegration [8]. Children have matured while their parent was away, and families may have developed new routines to which peacekeepers must adjust [9]. At an organizational level, returning peacekeepers usually face a return to in-garrison bureaucracy and red tape and decreased work challenge, relative to deployments. Returning home is also associated with significant organizational disruptions (i.e., unit reconfigurations, postings). If soldiers return to a unit where others did not deploy, they may face a lack of support from others [9]. Moreover, military culture has traditionally discouraged expressions of distress, which may significantly affect soldiers' willingness to admit problems and can therefore affect their post-deployment adaptation. Overall then, this abrupt return to "normal" roles and activities at personal, family and organizational levels can be a significant stressor [10; 11; 12].

The consequences of poor post-deployment reintegration and adjustment may be wide-ranging and have considerable long-term consequences for both returning soldiers and their families [13; 1; 14]. The process of post-deployment reintegration can lead to interpersonal changes that may modify the quality of relationships with immediate and extended family, friends, co-workers deployed with the individual, non-deploying co-workers, other members of the military, and even members of the public. Other significant post-deployment problems include alcohol abuse and dependence, generalized anxiety, antisocial behaviors, social isolation, hostility and anger [3]. Results such as these led Fontana and Rosenheck [5] to conclude that "... homecoming is critical ... in determining whether acute stress reactions are

either diminished to subclinical intensity or are preserved undiminished to become recognized at some later point ..." (p. 683).

As important as the existing literature has been in increasing awareness of these issues, our review of the existing post-deployment reintegration literature, including previous measures of reintegration, revealed several concerns. First, several measures existed which assessed related aspects of reintegration. Thus, there was a great deal of redundancy in the diverse measures that existed. Second, measures also tended to confound reintegration issues with social support. Third, previous reintegration measures have incomplete information concerning their psychometric properties, that is their basic reliability and underlying dimensional properties. Fourth, most of the information on reintegration was collected from Vietnam veterans years after they returned from war. Moreover, the majority of this information was obtained from veterans suffering from PTSD. Thus, the previous literature may suffer from biases of recall [15]. Fifth, virtually all of the published research in the area involves American military samples. At this point we know much less about the experience of Canadian soldiers in this regard. For these reasons the present research is directed toward: 1) developing a theoretically based post-deployment reintegration measure, 2) developing a reliable and valid measure that builds upon the best items of the existing scales, and 3) tailoring the measure for a Canadian military sample. The development of such a measure will be integral to a program of research directed at understanding the causes, correlates and consequences of reintegration issues for CF personnel.

The development of a multidimensional measure of post-deployment reintegration

We began our scale development efforts with information collected in focus groups of experienced CF peacekeepers who were undergoing predeployment training at the Peace Support Training Centre in Kingston [9]. Qualitative analyses of these discussions indicated that there were four main themes that emerged with respect to post-deployment reintegration for these soldiers. The first was personal reintegration and involved aspects of "feeling like oneself again." The second was family reintegration. The third theme was reintegration back into garrison life, with its restrictions and bureaucracy. The fourth theme we termed cultural reintegration and referred to returning from settings of extreme deprivation into a land of the "haves."

We also carefully reviewed the previous measures of reintegration available in the research literature. We selected from these scales those items that have the most information concerning the reliability and validity of their scale scores and that have the greatest degree of face validity, that is, relevance to the post-deployment reintegration of CF personnel based on their wording. We also reviewed the previous discussion group transcripts for wordings of potential items (any potentially identifying information was eliminated from these items). After compiling this initial set of items, we asked three CF members (two officers, and one non-commissioned officer, stationed at DRDC Toronto or at Land Force Central Area headquarters), who are veterans of multiple overseas deployments, to review the measure for clarity of instructions, as well as for item wording, readability etc. We made further modifications to the items based upon their suggestions. The result is a 64-item measure of

post-deployment covering four theoretical dimensions of reintegration (personal, family organizational and cultural) that is ready for administration to a sample of CF personnel.

This page intentionally left blank.

Method

Participants

Three hundred and seventy-four CF soldiers who participated in Op Apollo in Afghanistan served as respondents in this study. As Table 1 shows most respondents were noncommissioned soldiers (N=344/374 or 94% of the sample), between the ages of 22-36 (N=213, 58%). Twenty-two percent of the sample had 1 previous tour, 36% had two previous tours, while 42% of the sample had 3 or more previous tours. 28% had one deployment in the past 5 years, 56% had two deployments in the past 5 years and 16% of these soldiers had been on 3 or more tours in the past 5 years. The sample was about evenly split between married and single soldiers (58 and 42%, respectively). Approximately 60% of these soldiers had no dependents, while 40% had one of more children. Finally, 78 percent of the soldiers completing the questionnaires were in the combat arms, and 22% serve in support or administrative occupations.

Procedure

The Reintegration measure was presented in a mass testing session in a larger questionnaire that also included the Human Dimensions of Operations (HDO) Unit Climate Profile (UCP), as well as demographic questions. The Military Personnel Selection Officer from each base attended every survey session to introduce the study and discuss the purpose of the HDO questionnaires specifically. As the data collected in the context of the HDO project concerns unit morale and leadership and is confidential, results of the UCP data were not included in the present report.

Researchers from the Stress and Coping Group also attended each survey session. They discussed the background and purpose of the reintegration research and remained on hand to discuss any questions the soldiers may have pertaining to the reintegration research project. The questionnaire sessions were administered in rooms in training building on the bases. Although the survey was administered in groups, soldiers completed the questionnaires privately and individually.

After outlining the purpose of the study, troops were reminded that their participation was completely voluntary, and that arriving for the questionnaire session satisfied the request to participate, in order to minimize the possibility that any soldiers felt that they have been ordered to complete the questionnaire. Soldiers were then asked to review the survey instructions, which reiterated the purpose of the research, the risks and benefits of the study, as well as their rights as research participants. More specifically the information sheet made clear to participants that 1) only authorized personnel will have access to the data and only group results will be presented; 2) individual information will not be released to commanding officers and will not be used for performance evaluation purposes; and 3) that in the unlikely event of an Access to Information request, that the Access to Information Office is required, by law, to protect personal information and identities, in accordance with the Privacy Act. In addition to completing the measure, soldiers were encouraged to write down any suggestions

and comments they had on any aspect of the reintegration measure. After completing their surveys, soldiers returned their questionnaires to the researchers and were thanked for their participation in the research.

Material: The post-deployment reintegration questionnaire

The reintegration questionnaire is a 64-item measure assessing soldiers' perceptions and appraisals of the ease or difficulty they have experienced readjusting to the personal, family, organizational and community/cultural aspects of returning home. The scale, provided in Appendix A, includes items such as "I have a better understanding of other cultures" and "I am better able to handle situations that arise", reflecting the positive reintegration experiences. Approximately equal numbers of questions reflected potential negative reintegration experiences (e.g., "I have experienced difficulties readjusting into my community" and "I have been less productive at work"). As well, approximately equal number of items assessed each of the four dimensions of reintegration. Responses are indicated on a 5-point scale indicating how true (not at all true – completely true) each statement is for the soldier as a result of their tour in Afghanistan (see Appendix A). French and English versions of the questionnaire were available, although 99% of respondents answered the English version of the questionnaire.

Results

Overview

Data analyses addressing the psychometric quality of the new measure included factor and internal consistency reliability analyses. We used exploratory factor analyses to determine if, and to what extent, the items assessed the hypothesized dimensions of reintegration, that is, to determine the dimensionality of our reintegration measure. We examined factor loadings for purposes of item refinement, eliminating those items that did not make at least a moderate contribution to at least one of the hypothesized factors. Although we had built our post-deployment scale based on a-priori hypotheses, we favored – initially – an exploratory approach, as it provides further information to aid determining the number of factors, interpreting the nature of those factors, and refining the scale at subsequent stages of the research [16].

We also used reliability analyses focusing on item-total correlations and Cronbach's alphas in order to examine the internal consistency of the survey items falling into each of the dimensions or subscales of reintegration. Indices of reliability describe the extent to which the scores obtained by the measurement procedure can be reproduced [17]. Internal-consistency reliability procedures, such as corrected item-total correlations, provide an estimate of error associated with particular items. Cronbach's alpha provides an estimate of the overall internal consistency of a measure, based on the average inter-item correlation. Item refinement was also assisted by feedback from soldiers who had completed the survey. We specifically asked for their recommendations on item wording, and any reintegration issues that have not been addressed in the measure.

After the elimination of unsuitable items, we used descriptive analyses to identify the sources of the greatest amount of reintegration stress for this sample of respondents. Finally, we conducted ANOVA analyses to determine whether differences in reintegration issues emerged for the entire sample, and for selected demographic groups of soldiers.

Exploratory Factor Analyses

We conducted exploratory factor analyses (EFAs) with CEFA, an EFA program developed by Browne, Cudeck, Tateneni, and Mels [18]. Because listwise deletion resulted in $N = 300$ (out of 374 respondents), we replaced missing values by mean scores.[1] We submitted the resulting matrix of correlations to an oblique (direct quartimin) rotation, using both the maximum likelihood (ML) and ordinary least squares (OLS) estimation methods.[2] OLS procedures can be useful because of their relaxed distributional assumptions, but unless multivariate

[1] We also conducted the EFAs based on listwise deletion, as well as without a few outlying data points (with z-scores > 3.29; [19]), and we obtained very similar results.

[2] In EFA, factors are rotated to arrive at the solution with the best simple structure. *Oblique* rotation allows for correlations among factors, whereas *orthogonal* rotation does not. Oblique rotations result in a more realistic and accurate representation of how factors are likely to be related [20].

normality is clearly violated, ML estimation methods are preferable [20]. That is, ML procedures allow for significance tests of the factor loadings and correlations among factors. Additionally, most well-known indices of model fit have been developed based on ML methods. In the present research, we obtained very similar results for both procedures, so we report only the ML estimates and fit indices.

We present the chi-square statistics with its associated degrees of freedom as a measure of the goodness of fit of our hypothesized model of reintegration to the pattern of obtained data. However, because the chi-square statistic is sensitive to sample size, we also report an alternative measure of model fit, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) with its associated 90% confidence interval, which takes into account model complexity. Guidelines for the interpretation of the RMSEA values are as follows: < 0.05 indicates a close fit, between > 0.05 and < 0.08 suggests a fair fit, and RMSEA > 0.10 denotes a poor fit [21].

Because this study represents the initial test of our conceptualization of reintegration, we tested three models, which, as discussed previously, were derived a-priori, based on a theoretical framework: a two-factor, a four-factor, and an eight-factor model. Although the four and the eight-factor solutions make the most sense theoretically – and drove our item selection at the initial stage of scale development – we also investigated a two-factor (i.e., Negative/Positive) solution. In this case, reintegration involves clearly positive and negative experiences, but is relatively undifferentiated experience in terms of themes.

Two-factor solution: Positive and negative reintegration experiences

Although the RMSEA indicates an acceptable fit to the data, $\chi^2(1651) = 5412.73$, $p < .05$, RMSEA = .078(.076, .080), the value of the maximum absolute residual (.48) suggests the existence of large discrepancies between the sample and reproduced correlation matrices. The pattern of factor loadings is, in general, as hypothesized. Only two items cross-loaded on both factors, and only two items did not have salient loadings (i.e., above .30, our cutoff criterion; [22]). The estimated correlation between the two factors was .16, suggesting that positive experiences were relatively independent of negative experiences for these soldiers. In other words, soldiers reported experiencing both positive and negative experiences associated with reintegration. We report the parameter estimates associated with the two-factor solution in Table 2.

Four-factor solution: Personal, family, occupational, and cultural reintegration experiences

Although the RMSEA indicates an acceptable fit to the data, RMSEA = .063(.060, .065), $\chi^2(1536) = 3787.416$, $p < .05$, the value of the maximum absolute residual (.47) suggests, again, the existence of large discrepancies between the sample and reproduced correlation matrices. And interestingly, the pattern of factor loadings was not entirely as hypothesized and not easily interpretable. That is, most items labelled "Personal Positive," "Work Positive," and "Cultural Positive" loaded on Factor 1; the "Family Positive" items loaded on Factor 2; most of the "Work Negative" items loaded on Factor 3; finally, most of the

"Personal Negative," "Family Negative," and "Cultural Negative" items loaded on a fourth factor. The estimated factor intercorrelations ranged from .003 (between Factors 2 and 4) to .38 (between Factors 2 and 3). We report the parameter estimates associated with the four-factor solution in Table 3.

Eight-factor solution: Positive and negative experiences associated with personal, family, occupational, and cultural reintegration

The RMSEA indicates a good fit to the data, RMSEA = .044(.041, .047), $\chi^2(1318) = 2257.871$, $p < .05$, and the value of the maximum absolute residual was relatively small (.16). The pattern of factor loadings was not exactly as hypothesized, but it was very close to the expected solution. That is, most items labelled "Family Positive," "Family Negative," "Work Positive," "Work Negative," "Cultural Positive," and "Cultural Negative," loaded on Factors 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, respectively. The "Personal Positive" items loaded on three separate factors, whereas most of the "Personal Negative" items loaded with the "Cultural Negative" items, suggesting that these items need to be closely examined. The estimated factor intercorrelations ranged from .01 (between Factors 4 and 5) to .55 (between Factors 1 and 4). This suggests that, overall, the eight factors are relatively independent of each other. We report the parameter estimates associated with the eight-factor solution in Table 4. Based on the results of the factor analyses, we retained the eight-factor model as the one that best described the data. Most importantly, it also falls nicely within our theoretical framework.

Item analysis

Having decided that the eight-factor solution provided the best fit to the present data, we proceeded to ensure that the resulting eight subscales were reliable. As the item-total correlations, Cronbach's alphas (if item deleted), and item-level descriptive statistics presented in Table 5 show, each of the eight subscales yielded reliabilities ranging from .74 for the Positive Work items, to .86 for the negative personal reintegration items. Importantly, seven of the eight subscales had reliabilities above .77, suggesting that these subscales have adequate internal consistencies. Moreover, item-total correlations revealed that each of the items contributed to the overall strength of each of these subscales.

Item refinement

Multiple criteria guided our initial identification of those items that needed additional work: the pattern and magnitudes of their factor loadings (i.e., eight-factor solution); their item-total correlations (i.e., with their total subscale score); and the distribution of their response categories. Specifically, we considered those items with no salient loadings, salient loadings on multiple factors, and/or with item-total correlation of less than .30 [22] for elimination or modification purposes. Additionally, we examined whether the items produced sufficient variability. That is, if all respondents answered 1 to a particular item (i.e., not at all true), the item would not assist in describing or discriminating the reintegration experiences of these soldiers.

Items 17, 31, 52, and 56 had no salient factor loadings, whereas Items 7, 11, 19, 27, and 36 had salient loadings on two factors. A review of the wording of these items suggested that they probably loaded on multiple factors because their meaning was too broad and could apply to multiple areas of life (e.g., Item 19, "Getting back to my day-to-day activities has been hard."). There were only two items, Items 36 and 56 (already flagged as problematic), with item-total correlations below .30, our cutoff criterion. Finally, Items 34 and 54 exhibited extreme skewness and/or kurtosis (skewness > 3 and kurtosis > 7; [23]).

After the initial identification of those few problematic items, our team of researchers continued the work of item refinement over the course of multiple brainstorming sessions. Our sections' military liaison officer, a veteran of multiple overseas deployments, including peace support operations and military observer missions, and who had just returned from a mission, particularly aided our efforts. We examined and evaluated every individual item – with special attention to the items previously identified as problematic. Item refinement criteria based included face validity (i.e., the extent to which the item appears to assess the construct as defined), each items adequate representation and coverage of the hypothesized content domain, its relevance/meaningfulness to the target population, and its readability.

Our brainstorming sessions resulted in five items being dropped because of poor psychometric properties (i.e., Items 31, 52, 54, and 56) or relevance/clarity (i.e., Item 32). We then reran reliability analyses for each of the eight subscales on the reduced number of items to ensure that the internal consistencies of the scales remained acceptable. As Table 6 shows, mean item-total correlations and Cronbach's alphas for all subscales remained high or increased slightly as a result of this item elimination.

As well, we reworded Items 7, 11, 17, 19, 27, 34, and 36 to render them more specific to their hypothesized content domain (e.g., Item 7, "I feel a bit like a stranger in my own home." became "I feel like a stranger within my family."). We also slightly modified 23 other items, based on the recommendations of our subject matter expert, to make them more relevant to the target population and/or easier to read. Finally, we added 20 new items, with 30 items being retained from the first version of the scale, for a total of 80 items. We decided to retain all these new items for the next questionnaire iteration, as our goal is to ultimately retain only the "best" items that adequately cover the eight content domains. During our brainstorming sessions, we also evaluated the set of instructions and the response scale (e.g., nature and clarity of the anchors), as well as the item-to-response match (i.e., whether the item was phrased in a way that corresponded with the response options). We include the new version of the Reintegration Questionnaire in Appendix B.

Preliminary descriptive statistics

Because we decided to drop or modify some of the items used in the initial version of our instrument, the descriptive and group results associated with the initial version of the questionnaire and reported below are to be considered preliminary in nature. The results reported here are based on the initial version of the Reintegration Questionnaire, excluding the five items that we dropped.[3] We assigned items to subscales based on our a-priori

[3] We did not include Items 63 to 66 (i.e., spouse/partner, children), as only 123 individuals completed all four questions.

classification, which differs somewhat from the pattern of results associated with the eight-factor solution. For example, we assigned Item 46, "I find people here at home to be concerned with trivial things," to the Cultural Negative subscale, which loaded slightly higher on the Work Negative Factor. We obtained subscale scores by averaging item ratings within the same subscale, with higher scores meaning a greater (positive or negative) reintegration experience.

We conducted a (2 (item valence, e.g., positive/negative) X 4 (reintegration domain, e.g., personal/family/work/cultural)) within factor[4] analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the eight subscale scores to determine if these soldiers reported significantly different levels of reintegration experiences.[5] The two main effects for item valence and domain were statistically significant (item valence: $F(1, 373) = 382.31$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .51$; domain: ($F(2.655; 990.221) = 38.184$, $p<.000$, $\eta^2_p = .093$). These main effects were qualified by a significant interaction of valence and domain, $F(2.59, 966.86) = 298.25$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .50$.[6] As post-hoc analyses indicated, mean scores were significantly higher on the positive reintegration survey items associated with positive (versus negative) experiences in the personal, family and cultural domains. In the work domain however, the pattern was reversed. That is, mean scores were significantly higher for the negative work reintegration survey items than positive work reintegration experiences, $F(1, 373) = 24.35$, $\eta^2_p = .06$.[7]

We next investigated whether these soldiers felt significantly more positive on any particular reintegration domain or domains. Visual inspection of the reintegration subscale means dictated the particular means to be contrasted via additional post hoc analyses. These analyses revealed that the two highest mean scores, reflecting positive family and cultural reintegration experiences, were significantly more positive than work or cultural reintegration scores, $F(1, 373) = 224.50$, $\eta^2_p = .38$,[8] whereas the lowest mean positive subscale, post-deployment work roles was significantly less positive than the three remaining positive reintegration domains, $F(1, 373) = 543.02$, $\eta^2_p = .59$. Similar analyses were conducted on the negative experiences associated with each reintegration domain. Results here indicated that the highest negative reintegration experiences, associated with post-deployment work roles were significantly more negative than the other subscale scores $F(1, 373) = 429.26$, $\eta^2_p = .54$, whereas the lowest mean negative subscale score, reflecting negative personal experience, was significantly less negative than the three remaining reintegration domains $F(1, 373) = 303.32$, $\eta^2_p = .45$. In other words, these soldiers were most positive about their positive family and cultural reintegration experiences and were most negative about their negative work experiences.

---

[4] These are considered with-subject factors as all subjects completed each of these items.

[5] We corrected for departure from sphericity by adjusting the degrees of freedom using a Greenhouse-Geisser correction [24].

[6] Partial Eta squared (η_p^2) indicates the proportion of the variation in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variable; small, medium, and large effects are represented by, respectively, $\eta_p^2 = .01, .06$, and $.14$ [25].

[7] We use a corrected α-level (two-tailed) for all post-hoc analyses, based on a Bonferroni adjustment [24].

[8] More specifically, the target mean score(s) were contrasted with the average of the remaining 4 subscale scores.

Demographic group differences

We also looked at various characteristics of the respondents, as shown in Table 7, and tested whether reintegration subscale scores varied across selected demographic groups. In particular, we looked at marital status, number of dependents, number of tours (in total), and occupation category, as they seemed to be the demographic factors most likely to impact reintegration experiences. In these analyses item valence and reintegration domain were within-subject factors, while demographic group (e.g., marital status) was a between-subject factor[9][10].

First, we conducted an (2 (item valence - positive/negative) X 4 (reintegration domain - personal/family/work/cultural)) X 2 (marital status - married/single) mixed design analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the reintegration subscale scores[11]. Mean subscale scores significantly differed between married and single respondents only for the family and work domains, $F(2.72, 990.54) = 22.85$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .06$. That is, married soldiers reported significantly higher family reintegration scores (both positive and negative) than did single soldiers, $t(287.01) = 3.91$, $d = 0.47$, whereas single respondents had significantly higher work-related scores (both positive and negative), than did married respondents, $t(364) = 3.04$, $d = 0.32$.[12, 13]

We then conducted an (2 (positive/negative) X 4 (personal/family/work/cultural)) X 2 (dependents - none/one or more dependents) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the subscale scores to explore the impact of having dependants on soldier reintegration experiences. Mean subscale scores differed significantly between soldiers with or without children only for the family subscales, $F(2.59, 920.09) = 3.31$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .01$. That is, soldiers with dependants reported significantly greater levels of positive and negative family-related aspects of reintegration than did soldiers without dependents, $t(355) = 4.91$, $d = 0.54$.

We also conducted an (2 (positive/negative) X 4 (personal/family/work/cultural)) X 2 (occupation group – combat arms/combat support) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the eight subscale scores to determine if military occupation affected reintegration experiences. Mean subscale scores differed significantly between respondents within the combat arms versus respondents within the other occupations only for the Work Negative subscale, $F(2.61, 901.25) = 4.78$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .01$. That is, soldiers within the combat arms reported significantly greater levels of negative work-related aspects of reintegration than did soldiers within the other groups, $t(345) = 4.36$, $d = 0.57$.

Lastly, we conducted an (2 (positive/negative) X 4 (personal/family/work/ cultural)) X 3 (number of tours – one/two/three or more tours in total) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the reintegration scores to investigate whether number of previous tours affected the reintegration experiences of these soldiers. Results showed that respondents who had been deployed three

---

[9] Demographic grups are between subject factors because subjects can only fall into one of the groups.
[10] We collapsed data across demographic categories whenever the cell sizes were too small to yield meaningful statistical comparisons.

[12] We corrected for heterogeneity of variance whenever the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated [24].
[13] Cohen's d is a measure of effect size for paired-samples t-tests; small, medium, and large effects are represented by, respectively, $d = .20$, .50, and .80 [25].

or more times in total reported lower levels of reintegration overall, $F(2, 360) = 3.81$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, especially in comparison with respondents who had only deployed once, $t(230) = 2.73$, $d = 0.38$. Subsequent analyses at the subscale level indicated that the most experienced soldiers reported significantly less positive and negative experiences related to work and cultural reintegration ($t(198.69) = 3.77$, $d = 0.56$, and $t(230) = 3.23$, $d = 0.45$, for work and culture respectively).

This page intentionally left blank.

Discussion

This research was undertaken to begin the development of a multidimensional measure of post-deployment reintegration that would be relevant to the current experiences of CF personnel. An initial measure was created based upon a thorough review of the existing literature in the area of post-deployment reintegration and adaptation and on the results of our own prior study of the experiences of CF personnel who had previously deployed. This preliminary measure of post-deployment reintegration was then administered to CF Army personnel who had returned from Op Apollo, the first Canadian mission to Afghanistan. The initial psychometric findings are quite encouraging in terms of the scale development aims of this project. Factor analyses demonstrated the presence of the dimensions or themes we had expected to be integral to post-deployment reintegration. They also supported our expectation that there exist positive and negative aspects associated with reintegration. While one subscale had an associated reliability that was adequate (α=.74), seven of these eight subscales yielded excellent levels of reliability.

From an operational effectiveness point of view, the present findings are quite encouraging in terms of the relatively high levels of positive experiences and the low levels of negative experiences these soldiers endorsed concerning personal, family, and cultural post-deployment reintegration. The highest mean scores for the positive aspects of post-deployment reintegration were related to the family and cultural experiences. The highest mean scores associated with the negative aspects of post-deployment reintegration were related to occupational issues. This may suggest that work continues to be an issue for soldiers who have returned from a high intensity deployment such as Op Apollo, often because their post-deployment work seems to be less challenging and meaningful to them.

We saw some evidence of group differences on particular reintegration dimensions for soldiers, and these differences were associated with marital status, having dependents, occupational group, and number of previous deployments. More specifically, soldiers who were married and who had children reported higher levels of both positive and negative experiences associated with family reintegration. This finding makes perfect sense, as single soldiers have less day-to-day interaction with family, thus have less opportunity for the daily rewards and benefits, as well as the responsibilities and demands, associated family life.

Individuals serving in combat arms occupations were more likely to endorse reintegration items reflecting the negative aspects of post-deployment work roles, in comparison to soldiers serving in administrative and support roles. However soldiers in the combat arms did not differ from those in administrative or support occupations with respect to items reflecting positive work reintegration experiences, or items reflecting positive or negative personal, family and cultural reintegration. This finding may indicate that soldiers in the combat arms have the greatest contrast between deployment and post-deployment work activities. Thus, returning to the daily routine and bureaucracy may be more of a let down for soldiers in the combat arms than those who served in support or administrative capacities. At this point this explanation remains speculation. Future research specifically testing this hypothesis needs to be conducted to provide a more complete explanation of the reasons underlying these results.

Finally, soldiers who had deployed for the first time on Op Apollo indicated higher levels of both positive and negative experiences related to work and to cultural reintegration than did soldiers who had previously deployed three or more times. These results may indicate that veterans of three or more deployments experience less of a culture and work "shock" returning to Canada than do soldiers returning for the first time. However, it is not clear why these effects for deployment history occur only for the cultural and work issues only. Further research is needed corroborate and better explain these findings. Indeed, in general, it is important to note that these group differences are preliminary results of the initial version of this measure. Hence, these results should be interpreted with caution and need to be replicated.

It also is important to remember that these data were collected approximately nine months after soldiers returned from OP Apollo, arguably very late in the post-deployment reintegration process. It may be that most negative reintegration issues these soldiers encountered had been dealt with in the intervening months since their return from Afghanistan. This may account for the relatively low levels of negative post-deployment experiences seen here. There may also be biases of recall occurring after this length of time. Thus, results might have differed if the survey had been administered two to four months after soldiers had returned from their deployment, when reintegration issues may have been more acute and more salient for them.

On the other hand, it should also be noted that these soldiers had taken part in a three-day stopover in Guam that was specifically ordered by the commanding officer to assist soldiers in "winding down" from and dealing with the intensity of the tour. This opportunity may well have facilitated post-deployment reintegration for these soldiers. Anecdotal reports suggest that the soldiers felt that the stopover was beneficial. Systematic research of such programs that are being increasingly adopted by the militaries of several countries (e.g., the Netherlands, Germany) can better identify and measure the benefits of these programs and the psychological mechanisms associated with these benefits.

There are several additional areas of future research that should be undertaken. First, the reintegration measure will require continued testing, and where necessary, refinement. An integral part of this process will be the inclusion of additional measures that assess aspects of personal and operational readiness and effectiveness in future scale refinement work. In this way, we will proceed from establishing the dimensionality and the reliability of the scale to investigating the relationship of these aspects of post-deployment reintegration to important aspects of personal and operational readiness and effectiveness. Once the final measure is established, it would be useful to replicate the group differences seen here.

Moreover, it would be important to expand the groups of soldiers who complete the survey. For instance, some soldiers who serve in high stress occupations (such as medical support) were not included in the present survey. This is because such soldiers are often augmentees, that is individuals or small groups who are drawn from units around the country and are supplement or support the battle group. Thus, it is more difficult to find these individuals and groups after a deployment ends. However, as force projections estimate that up to thirty percent of future deployment will involve augmentees and reservists, the effect of deployments and post-deployment reintegration on augmentees will likely be an increasingly significant military human resource issue [9]. Finally, it would be beneficial to track soldiers

over time, as previous research in the area indicates that the effects of reintegration issues may take time to develop and that these long-term effects can be serious. Moreover, it would be beneficial to empirically establish how various predeployment and deployment factors affect the process of reintegration after a mission ends.

Overall, there are clear benefits in the development of a reliable measure of post-deployment reintegration issues tailored to the experiences of CF personnel. First, it allows researchers to assess and understand those aspects of reintegration that are of particular concern to CF personnel. Second, a reliable and valid measure of post-deployment reintegration can be used in research to understand the important consequences of post-deployment reintegration issues for CF personnel. This information can be used to better tailor the existing post-deployment programs and services, and where necessary develop new services and programs. Effectively addressing issues related to post-deployment reintegration should be an integral part of the CF's duty of care to their personnel sent into harm's way.

Table 1. *Demographic Breakdown of Soldiers Completing Reintegration Questionnaire*

Variable	Category	*n*	%
Rank (*n* = 367)	NCM	344	94
	Officer	23	6
Age group (*n* = 365)	17-21	11	3
	22-26	109	30
	27-31	104	28
	32-36	66	18
	37-41	52	14
	42+	23	6
Level of education (*n* = 361)	Some high school	35	11
	High school diploma	199	55
	Some university/college	91	25
	University/college diploma	36	10
Marital status (*n* = 366)	Married	212	58
	Single	154	42
Number of dependents (*n* = 357)	None	219	61
	One or more	138	39
Number of Deployments, in last 12 months (*n* = 367	Yes	110	30
	No	257	70
Total Number of Deployments (*n* = 363)	One	81	22
	Two	131	36
	Three or more	151	42
Number Deployments, previous five years (*n* = 349)	One	96	28
	Two	196	56
	Three	56	16
Occupation category (*n* = 347)	Combat arms	272	78
	Support/Admin staff	75	22

Table 2: Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Two-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor loading F1	F2
Personal Positive	In general, I am better able to handle situations that arise.	1	-.17	**.51**
	I am mentally tougher than I thought I was.	6	-.11	**.49**
	My spirituality has deepened.	17	.08	**.42**
	I have a different perspective on what is important in life.	24	**.36**	**.58**
	I have a greater appreciation of life in general.	39	.15	**.70**
	I have learned some positive things about myself.	45	.10	**.58**
	I have found new goals for my life.	52	.10	**.45**
	I feel proud of having served in Afghanistan.	59	-.13	**.50**
Personal Negative	Putting the events of the tour behind me has been tough.	14	**.72**	.08
	Getting back to my day-to-day activities has been hard.	19	**.77**	-.08
	I feel the tour has had a negative impact on my life.	27	**.65**	-.11
	I have learned some negative things about myself.	31	**.48**	.26
	I wish I had never gone on the tour.	34	**.37**	-.09
	It is taking time to feel like myself again.	42	**.79**	.02
	I have been confused about my war experiences.	48	**.67**	.02
	Focusing on other things than the tour has been difficult.	55	**.60**	.08
Family Positive	I have been more involved in my family relationships.	2	-.27	**.62**
	I have been more responsive to my family's needs.	10	-.14	**.63**
	My family has been welcoming.	11	-.10	**.40**
	I feel my family is proud of me.	22	-.10	**.44**
	I have realized how important my family is to me.	33	.21	**.63**
	I feel closer to my family.	37	-.09	**.63**
	I more fully appreciate the time I spend with my family.	47	.14	**.62**
Family Negative	I feel a bit like a stranger in my own home.	7	**.64**	-.08
	There has been tension in my family relationships.	25	**.60**	.00
	My family is resentful of me for being away.	29	**.31**	.03
	My family expects me to spend more time with them.	40	**.36**	.26
	I have to get to know my family all over.	44	**.55**	.03
	Getting myself back into the family routine has been hard.	51	**.74**	.02

Table 2 (cont'd): *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Two-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor loading	
Work Positive	My work motivation has increased.	3	**-.30**	**.49**
	I want to spend time with my buddies who were with me in Afghanistan.	9	.19	.22
	My enthusiasm for my job has grown.	16	-.25	**.56**
	I feel my career has advanced.	20	-.16	**.55**
	I feel I am a better soldier.	30	-.05	**.55**
	I have developed stronger friendships with other soldiers.	41	.08	**.43**
	I enjoy being back in a structured work environment.	43	-.13	**.44**
Work Negative	I have been less productive at work.	5	**.57**	-.12
	I feel a lower sense of accomplishment at work.	12	**.51**	-.10
	I find military bureaucracy more frustrating.	18	**.42**	-.04
	Readjusting to in-garrison routine has been tough.	23	**.58**	-.08
	I have needed time away from the people with whom I deployed.	36	**.30**	.11
	In-garrison life has been boring.	49	**.38**	-.10
	I have considered leaving the military.	53	**.43**	-.29
	I feel my current work duties are less meaningful.	58	**.48**	-.10
Cultural Positive	My community has been welcoming.	4	-.01	**.34**
	I have a better understanding of other cultures.	8	-.00	**.43**
	I have a greater appreciation of the conveniences taken for granted in Canada.	13	.17	**.61**
	I have a greater appreciation of the rights and freedoms taken for granted in Canada.	26	.20	**.61**
	I am more aware of problems in the world.	28	.13	**.51**
	I am more interested in what is happening in other countries.	35	.12	**.44**
	My community appreciates my efforts in Afghanistan.	50	-.07	**.42**
	I feel Canadian society understands what I have been through.	56	-.19	.27
Cultural Negative	I have experienced difficulties readjusting into my community.	15	**.80**	.00
	It has been hard to get used to being in Canada again.	21	**.66**	-.02
	I have had to remind myself that it is okay to step off the hard pack.	32	**.41**	.13
	Being back home in Canada has been a bit of a culture shock.	38	**.55**	.19
	I find people here at home to be concerned with trivial things.	46	**.40**	.22
	I no longer feel safe.	54	**.56**	-.03
	Dealing with memories of death and injuries has been tough.	57	**.60**	.15
	I have had difficulty reconciling the devastation I saw in Afghanistan with life in Canada.	60	**.63**	.16
	***r* of F1, F2**		**.16**	

Table 3: *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Four-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor loading			
			F1	F2	F3	F4
Personal	In general, I am better able to handle situations that arise.	1	**.39**	.21	-.11	-.11
Positive	I am mentally tougher than I thought I was.	6	**.47**	.14	-.02	-.11
	My spirituality has deepened.	17	.16	.27	-.18	.20
	I have a different perspective on what is important in life.	24	**.34**	**.36**	.08	**.33**
	I have a greater appreciation of life in general.	39	**.40**	**.39**	-.09	.22
	I have learned some positive things about myself.	45	**.60**	.12	.02	.09
	I have found new goals for my life.	52	**.37**	.18	.03	.09
	I feel proud of having served in Afghanistan.	59	**.55**	.15	.13	-.23
Personal	Putting the events of the tour behind me has been tough.	14	.04	.01	.02	**.74**
Negative	Getting back to my day-to-day activities has been hard.	19	-.04	.05	**.39**	**.56**
	I feel the tour has had a negative impact on my life.	27	**-.33**	.13	.02	**.68**
	I have learned some negative things about myself.	31	.11	.20	.12	**.43**
	I wish I had never gone on the tour.	34	**-.40**	.23	-.03	**.43**
	It is taking time to feel like myself again.	42	-.02	.03	.15	**.73**
	I have been confused about my war experiences.	48	-.05	.01	-.03	**.71**
	Focusing on other things than the tour has been difficult.	55	-.01	.08	.05	**.60**
Family	I have been more involved in my family relationships.	2	-.01	**.70**	-.23	-.13
Positive	I have been more responsive to my family's needs.	10	-.02	**.76**	-.12	-.06
	My family has been welcoming.	11	.07	**.51**	.23	-.25
	I feel my family is proud of me.	22	.19	**.43**	.20	-.24
	I have realized how important my family is to me.	33	.08	**.68**	.01	.22
	I feel closer to my family.	37	-.01	**.80**	.03	-.10
	I more fully appreciate the time I spend with my family.	47	.07	**.70**	.07	.12
Family	I feel a bit like a stranger in my own home.	7	.09	-.21	.05	**.64**
Negative	There has been tension in my family relationships.	25	-.04	-.04	-.08	**.69**
	My family is resentful of me for being away.	29	-.10	.05	-.16	**.43**
	My family expects me to spend more time with them.	40	.04	.25	.02	**.37**
	I have to get to know my family all over.	44	.04	-.07	-.10	**.63**
	Getting myself back into the family routine has been hard.	51	.05	-.06	.05	**.73**

Table 3 (cont'd): *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Four-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor loading			
			F1	F2	F3	F4
Work Positive	My work motivation has increased.	3	.26	.16	**-.53**	.03
	I want to spend time with my buddies who were with me in Afghanistan.	9	**.52**	-.16	.19	.06
	My enthusiasm for my job has grown.	16	**.33**	.16	**-.56**	.09
	I feel my career has advanced.	20	**.52**	.08	-.26	-.00
	I feel I am a better soldier.	30	**.74**	-.06	-.09	-.01
	I have developed stronger friendships with other soldiers.	41	.59	.01	.12	.00
	I enjoy being back in a structured work environment.	43	.19	.16	**-.49**	.18
Work Negative	I have been less productive at work.	5	-.08	.07	**.51**	.28
	I feel a lower sense of accomplishment at work.	12	.00	.12	**.72**	.09
	I find military bureaucracy more frustrating.	18	.04	.07	**.45**	.16
	Readjusting to in-garrison routine has been tough.	23	.06	.01	**.51**	.29
	I have needed time away from the people with whom I deployed.	36	-.11	.23	.09	.27
	In-garrison life has been boring.	49	.21	-.11	**.60**	.02
	I have considered leaving the military.	53	-.26	.01	**.40**	.21
	I feel my current work duties are less meaningful.	58	.18	-.05	**.73**	.05
Cultural Positive	My community has been welcoming.	4	.20	.23	.04	-.03
	I have a better understanding of other cultures.	8	**.32**	.14	-.12	.07
	I have a greater appreciation of the conveniences taken for granted in Canada.	13	**.45**	.29	.08	.13
	I have a greater appreciation of the rights and freedoms taken for granted in Canada.	26	**.42**	.28	-.01	.22
	I am more aware of problems in the world.	28	**.48**	.10	-.05	.17
	I am more interested in what is happening in other countries.	35	**.46**	.10	.08	.08
	My community appreciates my efforts in Afghanistan.	50	.24	.28	.04	-.10
	I feel Canadian society understands what I have been through.	56	.06	.20	-.18	-.08
Cultural Negative	I have experienced difficulties readjusting into my community.	15	.04	-.06	.08	**.78**
	It has been hard to get used to being in Canada again.	21	.09	-.15	.01	**.68**
	I have had to remind myself that it is okay to step off the hard pack.	32	.15	-.03	-.03	**.45**
	Being back home in Canada has been a bit of a culture shock.	38	.18	.02	-.01	**.57**
	I find people here at home to be concerned with trivial things.	46	**.31**	.06	.29	.23
	I no longer feel safe.	54	-.13	.04	.00	**.59**
	Dealing with memories of death and injuries has been tough.	57	.13	.02	.01	**.61**
	I have had difficulty reconciling the devastation I saw in Afghanistan with life in Canada.	60	.08	.08	.05	**.61**

Table 3 (cont'd): *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Four-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

		F1	F2	F3	F4
***r* among factors**	**F1**	--			
	F2	.14	--		
	F3	.15	.38	--	
	F4	.34	.00	-.12	--

Table 4: *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Eight-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor Loading							
			F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Personal	In general, I am better able to handle situations that arise.	1	**.46**	-.07	.21	-.12	.14	.20	.11	-.04
Positive	I am mentally tougher than I thought I was.	6	**.40**	.04	.08	-.03	.16	.25	.20	-.13
	My spirituality has deepened.	17	.18	-.09	.23	.10	-.01	-.04	.23	.05
	I have a different perspective on what is important in life.	24	-.01	.05	.25	.06	.10	.07	**.41**	.25
	I have a greater appreciation of life in general.	39	-.08	.05	.25	.05	.14	-.16	**.59**	.12
	I have learned some positive things about myself.	45	.05	.00	.15	.18	**.44**	.09	.27	-.03
	I have found new goals for my life.	52	.16	-.15	.21	.07	.19	.18	.24	-.01
	I feel proud of having served in Afghanistan.	59	-.07	.26	.11	-.08	**.51**	.01	.13	-.02
Personal	Putting the events of the tour behind me has been tough.	14	-.03	-.02	.00	-.04	.01	-.05	.02	**.86**
Negative	Getting back to my day-to-day activities has been hard.	19	-.12	.09	.01	.20	-.08	**.33**	-.02	**.42**
	I feel the tour has had a negative impact on my life.	27	.02	-.00	.02	.16	**-.44**	.05	.07	**.46**
	I have learned some negative things about myself.	31	-.07	-.07	.21	.24	.04	.13	.18	.19
	I wish I had never gone on the tour.	34	.09	-.01	.10	.06	**-.55**	.05	.09	.24
	It is taking time to feel like myself again.	42	-.12	.04	.01	.22	-.06	.09	.07	**.57**
	I have been confused about my war experiences.	48	-.03	-.01	-.01	.18	-.08	-.04	.05	**.58**
	Focusing on other things than the tour has been difficult.	55	.11	.06	.01	-.09	-.12	.08	.01	**.70**
Family	I have been more involved in my family relationships.	2	.28	-.01	**.72**	-.02	-.05	-.06	-.06	-.10
Positive	I have been more responsive to my family's needs.	10	.22	.02	**.75**	-.01	-.06	.03	.04	-.04
	My family has been welcoming.	11	-.02	**.56**	**.31**	-.22	.03	.10	-.12	.07
	I feel my family is proud of me.	22	-.07	**.52**	.25	-.23	.14	.03	-.02	.10
	I have realized how important my family is to me.	33	-.10	.07	**.62**	.20	.02	-.04	.22	.06
	I feel closer to my family.	37	-.06	.08	**.76**	-.09	.03	-.04	.04	.04
	I more fully appreciate the time I spend with my family.	47	-.08	.06	**.65**	.13	.04	.03	.16	.03

Table 4 (cont'd): *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Eight-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor Loading							
			F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Family Negative	I feel a bit like a stranger in my own home.	7	.06	-.05	-.18	**.31**	.01	.14	.03	**.37**
	There has been tension in my family relationships.	25	.06	.03	-.04	**.79**	-.12	.06	.04	-.00
	My family is resentful of me for being away.	29	-.01	-.08	.17	**.53**	.03	-.10	-.14	.03
	My family expects me to spend more time with them.	40	-.03	.02	.25	**.47**	-.01	.09	.10	-.06
	I have to get to know my family all over.	44	.01	-.03	.04	**.70**	.10	-.01	-.10	.11
	Getting myself back into the family routine has been hard.	51	-.06	.01	-.01	**.64**	.05	.10	-.01	.24
Work Positive	My work motivation has increased.	3	**.77**	.05	.07	.02	-.04	-.10	.02	-.02
	I want to spend time with my buddies who were with me in Afghanistan.	9	.17	.08	-.09	-.02	**.47**	.28	-.09	.22
	My enthusiasm for my job has grown.	16	**.71**	.03	.08	.05	.05	-.16	.07	.04
	I feel my career has advanced.	20	.23	.08	.07	.12	**.37**	-.14	.16	-.04
	I feel I am a better soldier.	30	.16	.06	-.03	.06	**.57**	-.01	.22	.03
	I have developed stronger friendships with other soldiers.	41	.07	.08	.02	-.05	**.47**	.13	.14	.15
	I enjoy being back in a structured work environment.	43	.20	.08	.05	.07	.02	**-.41**	.26	.10
Work Negative	I have been less productive at work.	5	-.27	.03	.00	.04	-.13	**.36**	.14	.20
	I feel a lower sense of accomplishment at work.	12	-.22	.18	.03	.11	-.08	**.63**	.03	-.03
	I find military bureaucracy more frustrating.	18	.02	-.16	.14	-.00	-.01	**.56**	-.04	.12
	Readjusting to in-garrison routine has been tough.	23	-.01	.11	.03	.13	.05	**.53**	-.19	.25
	I have needed time away from the people with whom I deployed.	36	-.09	-.06	.09	.02	**-.33**	.08	**.40**	.07
	In-garrison life has been boring.	49	-.04	-.08	-.05	.03	.13	**.67**	.00	-.03
	I have considered leaving the military.	53	-.18	-.13	.02	.05	-.26	**.36**	.03	.06
	I feel my current work duties are less meaningful.	58	-.05	-.02	-.08	-.03	-.00	**.81**	.11	-.02

Table 4 (cont'd): *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Eight-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

Dimension	Item	Item #	Factor Loading							
			F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Cultural Positive	My community has been welcoming.	4	.11	**.71**	-.09	.12	-.02	-.02	.07	-.05
	I have a better understanding of other cultures.	8	.09	.05	.00	-.06	.04	-.07	**.44**	.03
	I have a greater appreciation of the conveniences taken for granted in Canada.	13	.10	.22	.02	-.06	.00	.12	**.61**	.06
	I have a greater appreciation of the rights and freedoms taken for granted in Canada.	26	.07	.13	.00	.01	-.06	.03	**.75**	.03
	I am more aware of problems in the world.	28	.08	-.11	-.03	-.05	.10	.03	**.67**	.04
	I am more interested in what is happening in other countries.	35	-.02	-.14	.06	-.05	.23	.11	**.48**	.03
	My community appreciates my efforts in Afghanistan.	50	.00	**.68**	-.01	.07	.07	-.08	.10	-.05
	I feel Canadian society understands what I have been through.	56	.01	.24	.08	.05	.00	-.23	.10	-.10
Cultural Negative	I have experienced difficulties readjusting into my community.	15	-.02	.02	-.07	.25	-.02	.09	.02	**.60**
	It has been hard to get used to being in Canada again.	21	.08	.05	-.16	.11	.01	.05	-.02	**.63**
	I have had to remind myself that it is okay to step off the hard pack.	32	.10	-.10	-.02	.05	.03	.06	.14	**.37**
	Being back home in Canada has been a bit of a culture shock.	38	.04	-.00	.06	.18	.15	.02	.01	**.49**
	I find people here at home to be concerned with trivial things.	46	.12	.01	.05	.22	.12	**.45**	.12	.02
	I no longer feel safe.	54	.01	-.10	.04	.13	-.18	.05	.04	**.44**
	Dealing with memories of death and injuries has been tough.	57	-.05	-.06	.07	.03	.15	-.05	.02	**.69**
	I have had difficulty reconciling the devastation I saw in Afghanistan with life in Canada.	60	-.05	.00	.05	-.06	.02	-.02	.10	**.72**

Table 4 (cont'd): *Factor Loadings and Intercorrelations for Exploratory Eight-Factor Model of Reintegration Scale (N = 374)*

		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
r among factors	**F1**	--							
	F2	.37	--						
	F3	.10	-.04	--					
	F4	.55	.24	.05	--				
	F5	-.11	-.25	.28	-.01	--			
	F6	.08	.03	.30	-.05	.07	--		
	F7	-.06	.05	.15	-.08	.22	.19	--	
	F8	.31	.13	.38	.20	.21	.22	.27	--

***Table 5**: Reliability Analysis of Retained Reintegration Items (N = 374)*

Item	Item #	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-total *r*	α if item deleted
Personal Positive (mean item-total *r* = .50; α = .79)							
In general, I am better able to handle situations that arise.	1	2.89	1.21	-0.18	-0.84	.43	.78
I am mentally tougher than I thought I was.	6	2.92	1.20	-0.08	-0.82	.47	.77
My spirituality has deepened.	17	1.65	0.97	1.48	1.47	.41	.78
I have a different perspective on what is important in life.	24	2.86	1.31	0.06	-1.07	.56	.76
I have a greater appreciation of life in general.	39	2.82	1.28	0.10	-1.05	.60	.75
I have learned some positive things about myself.	45	3.15	1.19	-0.05	-0.73	.59	.75
I have found new goals for my life.	52	2.73	1.28	0.16	-1.00	.50	.77
I feel proud of having served in Afghanistan.	59	4.32	0.99	-1.57	2.07	.41	.78
Personal Negative (mean item-total *r* = .61; α = .86)							
Putting the events of the tour behind me has been tough.	14	1.99	1.21	1.03	0.02	.69	.83
Getting back to my day-to-day activities has been hard.	19	2.15	1.19	0.71	-0.54	.65	.83
I feel the tour has had a negative impact on my life.	27	1.62	1.07	1.79	2.37	.68	.83
I have learned some negative things about myself.	31	2.23	1.15	0.72	-0.21	.46	.86
I wish I had never gone on the tour.	34	1.27	0.85	3.50	11.63	.41	.86
It is taking time to feel like myself again.	42	2.24	1.33	0.77	-0.56	.74	.83
I have been confused about my war experiences.	48	1.55	0.96	1.95	3.33	.63	.84
Focusing on other things than the tour has been difficult.	55	1.54	0.89	1.88	3.27	.62	.84
Family Positive (mean item-total *r* = .61; α = .85)							
I have been more involved in my family relationships.	2	2.52	1.20	0.25	-0.87	.63	.83
I have been more responsive to my family's needs.	10	2.48	1.10	0.27	-0.72	.70	.82
My family has been welcoming.	11	4.08	0.95	-1.25	1.63	.48	.85
I feel my family is proud of me.	22	4.14	0.99	-1.24	1.16	.44	.85
I have realized how important my family is to me.	33	3.32	1.27	-0.31	-0.92	.65	.83
I feel closer to my family.	37	2.83	1.25	0.13	-0.95	.74	.81
I more fully appreciate the time I spend with my family.	47	3.23	1.20	-0.23	-0.86	.65	.83

Table 5 (cont'd): *Reliability Analysis of Retained Reintegration Items (N = 374)*

Item	Item #	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-total *r*	α if item deleted
Family Negative (mean item-total *r* = .58; α = .81)							
I feel a bit like a stranger in my own home.	7	1.60	0.98	1.71	2.29	.51	.80
There has been tension in my family relationships.	25	2.11	1.29	0.90	-0.39	.70	.76
My family is resentful of me for being away.	29	1.51	0.87	1.92	3.51	.47	.81
My family expects me to spend more time with them.	40	2.61	1.25	0.23	-1.01	.46	.81
I have to get to know my family all over.	44	1.70	1.00	1.43	1.38	.64	.77
Getting myself back into the family routine has been hard.	51	2.03	1.19	0.94	-0.13	.71	.75
Work Positive (mean item-total *r* = .46; α = .74)							
My work motivation has increased.	3	2.01	1.10	0.74	-0.55	.45	.71
I want to spend time with my buddies who were with me…	9	2.54	1.17	0.20	-0.78	.31	.74
My enthusiasm for my job has grown.	16	1.82	0.98	0.97	0.01	.57	.69
I feel my career has advanced.	20	2.18	1.16	0.53	-0.82	.53	.69
I feel I am a better soldier.	30	3.10	1.18	-0.21	-0.66	.55	.68
I have developed stronger friendships with other soldiers.	41	2.89	1.21	-0.02	-0.89	.45	.71
I enjoy being back in a structured work environment.	43	2.20	1.14	0.60	-0.55	.34	.73
Work Negative (mean item-total *r* = .52; α = .81)							
I have been less productive at work.	5	1.75	1.08	1.42	1.28	.55	.78
I feel a lower sense of accomplishment at work.	12	2.36	1.34	0.61	-0.83	.63	.77
I find military bureaucracy more frustrating.	18	3.78	1.24	-0.80	-0.35	.53	.78
Readjusting to in-garrison routine has been tough.	23	2.48	1.35	0.52	-0.92	.56	.78
I have needed time away from the people with whom I deployed.	36	2.49	1.30	0.56	-0.69	.23	.82
In-garrison life has been boring.	49	3.30	1.38	-0.23	-1.22	.55	.78
I have considered leaving the military.	53	2.75	1.54	0.24	-1.44	.45	.80
I feel my current work duties are less meaningful.	58	2.72	1.42	0.29	-1.21	.69	.76

***Table 5 (cont'd)**: Reliability Analysis of Retained Reintegration Items (N = 374)*

Item	Item #	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-total *r*	α if item deleted
Cultural Positive (mean item-total *r* = .45; α = .75)							
My community has been welcoming.	4	3.65	1.10	-0.74	-0.04	.37	.74
I have a better understanding of other cultures.	8	2.84	1.11	0.08	-0.60	.40	.73
I have a greater appreciation of the conveniences…	13	3.60	1.25	-0.63	-0.55	.59	.70
I have a greater appreciation of the rights and freedoms…	26	3.11	1.31	-0.13	-1.07	.64	.68
I am more aware of problems in the world.	28	2.74	1.15	0.14	-0.69	.53	.71
I am more interested in what is happening in other countries.	35	2.69	1.17	0.18	-0.70	.43	.73
My community appreciates my efforts in Afghanistan.	50	3.65	1.14	-0.58	-0.45	.42	.73
I feel Canadian society understands what I have been through.	56	1.95	0.97	0.76	-0.05	.18	.77
Cultural Negative (mean item-total *r* = .55; α = .82)							
I have experienced difficulties readjusting into my community.	15	1.76	1.07	1.37	1.16	.69	.78
It has been hard to get used to being in Canada again.	21	1.42	0.80	2.20	5.10	.63	.79
I have had to remind myself that it is okay to step off the hard pack.	32	1.56	0.93	1.67	1.94	.45	.81
Being back home in Canada has been a bit of a culture shock.	38	1.72	0.98	1.33	1.09	.56	.80
I find people here at home to be concerned with trivial things.	46	3.39	1.24	-0.32	-0.84	.37	.83
I no longer feel safe.	54	1.30	0.79	2.92	8.33	.50	.81
Dealing with memories of death and injuries has been tough.	57	2.07	1.20	1.03	0.17	.59	.79
I have had difficulty reconciling the devastation I saw…	60	1.60	1.00	1.86	2.96	.63	.79

Note: values in bold refer to values for the entire subscale, values in plain type refer to results for that item.

Table 6: *Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities for the Reintegration Subscales with Five Items Deleted (N = 374)*

Subscale	Number of items	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Mean item-total *r*	α
Personal Positive	7	2.94	0.75	-0.05	-0.25	.49	.77
Personal Negative	7	1.76	0.79	1.16	0.76	.63	.86
Family Positive	7	3.23	0.83	-0.18	-0.44	.61	.85
Family Negative	6	1.93	0.80	0.79	-0.10	.58	.81
Work Positive	7	2.39	0.71	0.35	-0.21	.46	.74
Work Negative	8	2.70	0.87	0.27	-0.63	.52	.81
Cultural Positive	7	3.18	0.76	-0.26	-0.33	.49	.77
Cultural Negative	6	1.99	0.74	1.07	1.03	.57	.80

Variable	*n*	%	Personal		Family		Work		Cultural	
			+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
Marital status (*n* = 366)										
Married	212	58	2.95 (.71)	1.78 (.81)	3.35 (.81)[a]	2.01 (.78)[b]	2.37 (.69)[c]	2.60 (.84)[d]	3.19 (.75)	1.97 (.72)
Single	154	42	2.95 (.82)	1.76 (.78)	3.05 (.85)[a]	1.81 (.83)[b]	2.43 (.75)[c]	2.85 (.90)[d]	3.17 (.79)	2.03 (.78)
Number of dependants (*n* = 357)										
None	219	61	2.94 (.76)	1.73 (.75)	3.08 (.83)[e]	1.84 (.75)[f]	2.39 (.69)	2.80 (.87)	3.16 (.77)	1.99 (.75)
One or more	138	39	2.94 (.75)	1.86 (.86)	3.44 (.80)[e]	2.11 (.86)[f]	2.40 (.72)	2.57 (.88)	3.21 (.76)	2.02 (.74)
Occupation category (*n* = 347)										
Combat arms	272	78	2.94 (.76)	1.75 (.79)	3.17 (.83)	1.94 (.82)	2.39 (.71)	2.81 (.87)[g]	3.16 (.76)	2.02 (.78)
Support/Admin staff	75	22	2.94 (.77)	1.75 (.80)	3.46 (.83)	1.84 (.72)	2.41 (.69)	2.32 (.78)[g]	3.26 (.80)	1.89 (.63)
Deployment, total (*n* = 363)										
One	81	22	3.04 (.73)	1.83 (.91)	3.27 (.82)	1.99 (.85)	2.53 (.75)[h]	2.81 (.82)[i]	3.40 (.75)[j]	2.07 (.79)[k]
Two	131	36	2.99 (.75)	1.74 (.73)	3.19 (.85)	1.93 (.80)	2.44 (.72)	2.76 (.84)	3.21 (.75)	1.98 (.73)
Three or more	151	42	2.84 (.75)	1.74 (.78)	3.21 (.82)	1.89 (.78)	2.27 (.65)[h]	2.58 (.94)[i]	3.02 (.74)[j]	1.94 (.71)[k]

Note: - Standard deviations are presented in brackets.
- Means annotated with the same letter superscripts indicates group differences that are statistically significant ($p < .05$).

References

1. Bolton, E. E., Litz, B. T., Glenn, D. M. Orsillo, S., & Roemer, L. (2002). The impact of homecoming reception on the adaptation of peacekeepers following deployment. *Military Psychology, 14*, 241-251.

2. Litz, B. T., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1997). Warriors as peacekeepers: Features of the Somalia experience and PTSD. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 1001-1010.

3. Orsillo, S. M., Roemer, L., Litz, B. T., Ehlich, P., & Friedman, M. J. (1998). Psychiatric symptomatology associated with contemporary peacekeeping: An examination of post-mission functioning among peacekeepers in Somalia. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 11*, 611-625.

4. Adler, A. B., Vaitkus, M. A., & Martin, J. A. (1996). Combat exposure and posttraumatic stress symptomology among U.S. soldiers deployed to the Gulf War. *Military Psychology, 8*, 1-14.

5. Fontana, A. & Rosenheck, R. (1994). Posttraumatic stress disorder among Vietnam theater veterans: A causal model of etiology in a community sample. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease, 182*, 677-684.

6. MacDonald, C., Pereira-Laird, J., Chamberlain, K., Mirfin, K., & Long, N. (1998). Mental health, physical health & stressors reported by New Zealand Defence Force peacekeepers: A longitudinal study. *Military Medicine, 163*, 7, 477-481.

7. Wilson, J. P. & Krause, G. E. (1985). Predicting post-traumatic stress disorder among Vietnam veterans. In W. E. Kelly (Ed.), *Post-traumatic stress disorder and the war veteran patient* (pp. 102-147). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

8. Johnson, D. R., Lubin, H., Rosenheck, R., Fontana, A., Southwick, S., & Charney, D. (1997). Treatment preferences of Vietnam veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress 10*, 391-405.

9. Thompson M. M. & Gignac, M. A. M. (2001). Adaptation to peace support operations: The experience of Canadian Forces Augmentees. In P. Essens, A. Vogelaar, E. Tanercan, & D. Winslow, Eds.), *The Human in Command: Peace Support Operations* (pp. 235-263). Amsterdam: Mets & Schilt/KMA.

10. Bercuson, D. (1996). *Significant Incident: Canada's army, the airborne, and the murder in Somalia.* Toronto, ON: McClelland and Stewart, Inc.

11. Rosebush, P. A., (1998). Psychological intervention with military personnel in Rwanda. *Military Medicine, 163*, 559-563.

12. Thompson, M. M. & Pastò, L. (2003). Psychological Interventions in Peace Support Operations:Current Practices and Future Challenges. In T. W. Britt & A. B. Adler (Eds.), *The psychology of the peacekeeper: A multinational perspective*.Westport: CT , Praeger Press.

13. Benotsch, E. G., Brailey, K., Vasterling, J. J. Uddo, M., Constans, J. I., & Sutker, P. B. (2000). War Zone stress, personal and environmental resources, and PTSD symptoms in Gulf War Veterans: A longitudinal perspective. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, *109*, 205-213.

14. Ruscio, A. M., Weathers, F. W., King, L. A., King, D. W. (2002). Male war-zone veterans' perceived relationships with their children: The importance of emotional numbing. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 15*, 351-357.

15. Ross, M. (1989). Relation of implicit memories to the construction of personal histories. *Psychological Review*, 96, 341-357.

16. Tucker, L.R. & MacCallum, R.C. (1997). *Exploratory Factor Analysis*, Unpublished book manuscript.

17. John, O.P. & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Measurement, scale construction, and reliability. In Reis, H.T. and Judd, C.M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology* (pp. 339-369). New York: Cambridge University Press.

18. Browne, M.W., Cudeck, R., Tateneni, K., & Mels G. (1999). *CEFA: Comprehensive Exploratory Factor Analysis, Version 1.03*. [WWW document and computer program]. URL: http://quantrm2.psy.ohio-state.edu/browne/.

19. Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

20. Wegener, D. T. & Fabrigar, L. R. (2000). Analysis and design for nonexperimental data: Addressing causal and noncausal hypotheses. In H. T.Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 412-450). New York: Cambridge University Press.

21. Browne, M.W. & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K.A. Bollen, & J.S. Long (Eds), *Testing structural equation models* (pp.136-161). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

22. Nunally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

23. Kline, R.B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*, New York: The Guilford Press.

24. Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prenctice Hall.

25. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Annex A: Postdeployment Reintegration Survey – Version 1

REINTEGRATION SURVEY

For the next set of questions please indicate the extent to which each of the statements below is true for you since your return and as a result of your tour in Afghanistan. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. People may have differing views and we are interested in what your experiences are. **Please indicate the extent to which each of the statements below is true for you since your return and as a result of your tour in Afghanistan:**

AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:

	Not at all True	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Very True	Completely True
1. In general, I am better able to handle situations that arise	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
2. I have been more involved in my family relationships.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
3. My work motivation has increased.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
4. My community has been welcoming.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
5. I have been less productive at work.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
6. I am mentally tougher than I thought I was.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
7. I feel a bit like a stranger in my own home.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
8. I have a better understanding of other cultures.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	**Not at all True**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Very True**	**Completely True**
9. I want to spend time with my buddies who were with me in Afghanistan	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
10. I have been more responsive to my family's needs.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
11. My family has been welcoming.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
12. I feel a lower sense of accomplishment at work.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
13. I have a greater appreciation of the conveniences taken for granted in Canada.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

14. Putting the events of the tour behind me has been tough.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
15. I have experienced difficulties readjusting into my community.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	**Not at all True**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Very True**	**Completely True**
16. My enthusiasm for my job has grown.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
17. My spirituality has deepened.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
18. I find military bureaucracy more frustrating.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
19. Getting back to my day-to-day activities has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
20. I feel my career has advanced.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
21. It has been hard to get used to being in Canada again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
22. I feel my family is proud of me.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
23. Readjusting to in-garrison routine has been tough.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
24. I have a different perspective on what is important in my life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
25. There has been tension in my family relationships.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
26. I have a greater appreciation of the rights and freedoms taken for granted in Canada.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	**Not at all True**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Very True**	**Completely True**
27. I feel the tour has had a negative impact on my life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
28. I am more aware of problems in the world.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
29. My family is resentful of me for being away during my deployment	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
30. I feel I am a better soldier.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
31. I have learned some negative things about myself.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

32. I have had to remind myself that it is okay to step off the hard pack.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
33. I have realized how important my family really is to me.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
34. I wish I had never gone on the tour.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	**Not at all True**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Very True**	**Completely True**
35. I am more interested in what is happening in other countries.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
36. I have needed time away from the people with whom I deployed.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
37. I feel closer to my family.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
38. Being back home in Canada has been a bit of a culture shock.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
39. I have a greater appreciation of life in general.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
40. My family expects me to spend more time with them.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
41. I have developed stronger friendships with other soldiers.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
42. It is taking time to feel like myself again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
43. I enjoy being back in a structured work environment.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
44. I have to get to know my family all over again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
45. I have learned some positive things about myself.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	**Not at all True**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Very True**	**Completely True**
46. I find people here at home to be concerned about trivial things.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
47. I more fully appreciate the time I spend with my family.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
48. I have been confused about my war experiences.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

49. In-garrison life has been boring.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
50. My community appreciates my efforts in Afghanistan.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
51. Getting myself back into the family routine has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
52. I have found new goals for my life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
53. I have considered leaving the military.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	**Not at all True**	**Slightly True**	**Somewhat True**	**Very True**	**Completely True**
54. I no longer feel safe.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
55. Focusing on other things that the tour has been difficult.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
56. I feel Canadian society understands what I have been through.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
57. Dealing with memories of death and injuries has been tough.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
58. I feel my current work duties are less meaningful.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
59. I feel proud of having served in Afghanistan.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
60. I have had difficulty reconciling the devastation I saw in Afghanistan with life in Canada.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

If you do not have a spouse/partner please skip the next two questions.

AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:					
61. There has been conflict in my marriage or significant relationship.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
62. My spouse/partner has been reluctant to give up household decisions.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

If you do not have children please skip the next two questions.

AS A RESULT OF MY TOUR, SINCE MY RETURN FROM AFGHANISTAN:	Not at all	Slightly	Somewhat	Very	Completely
63. I find my kid(s) have matured more than I expected.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
64. Relating to my kid(s) has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your present Rank?
   - O Jr. NCM (Pte to MCpl)
   - O Snr NCM (Sgt to CWO)
   - O Jnr Off
   - O Snr Off

2. What is your age?
   - O 17-21
   - O 22-26
   - O 27-31
   - O 32-36
   - O 37-41
   - O 42-46
   - O 47-51
   - O 52-55+

3. What is your sex?
   - O Male
   - O Female

4. What is your highest level of education?
   - O Some high school
   - O High school diploma (Sec V)
   - O Some university / Some college (CEGEP II)
   - O University degree / College degree
   - O Graduate degree

5. What is your first official language?
   - O English
   - O French

6. What is your marital status?
   - O Married (incl common-law)
   - O Single (incl divorced, widowed, separated)

7. Dependents: Excluding your partner/spouse how many dependents live with you?
   O 0 O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O+5

8. How many years of service in the Forces have you? _____

9. What is your status and how long had you been with your unit in Afganistan?
   - O augmentee
   - O permanent member and less than 6 months
   - O permanent member more than 6 months
   - O permanent member more than 1 year

11. If you had previously responded to this survey in theatre, please indicate in which phases:
    - O Pre-deployment
    - O Deployment Phase 1 (1.5 - 2 mths in theatre)
    - O Deployment Phase 2 (2 – 4.5 mths in theatre)
    - O Deployment Phase 3 (4.5-6 mths in theatre)

12. Prior to this operational tour, have you been deployed on a UN or NATO tour in the last 12 months:
    - O Yes
    - O No

13. How many UN or NATO tours have you had (including Op Apollo):
    a. in total:
    O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5+
    b. In the last 5 years:
    O 1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5+

14. What type of occupation category are you employed?
    - O Combat Arms
    - O Support Staff
    - O Admin Staff

GENERAL COMMENTS

We welcome your comments about any aspect of this survey. Remember, we do not identify individuals. We are concerned only with how we might be able to improve operational effectiveness.

As a reminder, first, do not write your name or service number anywhere on this questionnaire. Second, ensure that any written comments you may offer are sufficiently general that you cannot be identified as the author.

1. General comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your time and participation.

REFERRAL LIST

BELOW is a list of health care providers in the Edmonton Area. This list is provided should you feel the need to discuss your reactions to any experiences you have had in the military.
We encourage you to remove this sheet and take it with you.

Mental Health Services
Health Service Clinic
Building 162
(780) 973-4011 ext 5332

CF Members Assistance Program
1-800-268-7708

Garrison Personnel Development Office
(780) 973-4011 ext 5819

MFRC
Counseling Services
973-4011 ex 6300
Marg Eagle

OSSTC Website:
http://www.forces.gc.ca/health/services/engraph/otssc_home_e.asp?hssubmenu

Serving members who have a medical problem they feel is related to an operational deployment and whose medical diagnosis is not yet clear, can request a referral to a Postdeployment Health Clinic by contacting your local medical facilities.

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO DETACH THIS SHEET

Annex B: Revised Reintegration Measure – Version 2

Reintegration Survey

There are no right or wrong answers to the following questions. People may have differing views, and we are interested in what your experiences are. **Please indicate the extent to which each of the statements below is true for you since returning from your overseas deployment:**

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
1. I find military bureaucracy more frustrating.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
2. I am more aware of problems in the world.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
3. Putting the events of the tour behind me has been tough	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
4. I still feel like I am "on the edge."	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
5. My work motivation has increased.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
6. I have felt "out of sorts."	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
7. There has been tension in my family relationships.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
8. I have a better understanding of other cultures.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
9. I have had difficulty reconciling the devastation I saw overseas with live in Canada	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
10. I have had trouble dealing with changes within my family.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
11. I am applying job-related skills I learned during my deployment.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
12. I am glad I went on the tour.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

13. I am more interested in what is happening in other countries.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
14. Dealing with memories of death and injuries has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
15. I have experienced difficulties readjusting to life in Canada	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
16. I feel my current work duties are less meaningful.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
17. My sense of religion or spirituality has deepened.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
18. I feel my career has advanced.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
19. I feel my family is proud of me.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
20. I am mentally tougher than I thought I was.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
21. I have felt like a stranger within my family.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
22. It has been hard to get used to being in Canada again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
23. I have become more responsive to my family's needs.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
24. I have a greater appreciation of life in Canada.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
25. I find the world to be a more horrible place than I thought it was.					
26. It has taken time to feel like myself again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
27. I have realized how well off we are in Canada.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
28. I have been confused about my experiences during the tour.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

29. I feel my community appreciates my efforts overseas.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
30. I am more cynical about humanity.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
31. Being back in Canada has been a bit of a culture shock.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
32. I have a greater appreciation of the value of life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
33. Focusing on things other than the tour has been diffucult.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
34. I have become more involved in my family relationships.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
35. The tour has put a strain on my family life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
36. Garrison life has been boring.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
37. I have had to get to know my family all over again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
38. My enthusiasm for my job has grown.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
39. I am better able to deal with stress.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
40. Day-to-day work tasks seem tedious.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
41. I would have liked more leave to feel like myself again.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
42. I feel a stronger sense of teamwork within my unit.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
43. Getting myself back into the family routine has been difficult.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

44. I feel a lower sense of accomplishment at work.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
45. I have realized how important my family is to me.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	**Not at all true**	**Slightly true**	**Somewhat true**	**Very true**	**Completely true**
46. On a personal level, I have learned some positive things about myself	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
47. I have questioned my faith in humanity.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
48. I feel more self-reliant.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
49. I feel closer to my family.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
50. I find that my family would like me to spend more time with them.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
51. Getting back "into sync" with family life has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
52. I want to spend time with my buddies from the tour.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
53. I have been less productive at work.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	**Not at all true**	**Slightly true**	**Somewhat true**	**Very true**	**Completely true**
54. I have a greater willingness to be with my family.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
55. I feel my community has welcomed me.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
56. I find people here in Canada to be concerned about trivial things.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
57. People have made me feel proud to have served m country	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
58. I more fully appreciate the time I spend with my family	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

59. Readjusting to garrison routine has been tough.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
60. I feel my family resented my absence.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
61. I have a greater appreciation of the conveniences taken for granted in Canada	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	**Not at all true**	**Slightly true**	**Somewhat true**	**Very true**	**Completely true**
62. The people I work with respect the fact that I was on tour.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
63. I feel my family has had difficulty understanding me	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
64. Getting back to my "old self" has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
65. I wish I could spend time away from the people with whom I deployed	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
66. I feel I am a better soldier.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
67. I have changed my priorities in my life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
68. I have a greater appreciation of each day.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
69. I am proud of having served overseas.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	**Not at all true**	**Slightly true**	**Somewhat true**	**Very true**	**Completely true**
70. I more fully appreciate the rights and freedoms taken for granted in Canada.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
71. I have developed stronger friendships	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
72. I feel my family has welcomed me	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
73. I have considered leaving the military.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
74. I have a more positive perspective on what is important in life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
75. I enjoy being back in garrison.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

76. I feel the tour has had a negative impact on my personal life.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

If you do not have a spouse/partner please skip the next two questions.

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
77. There has been conflict in my marriage or significant relationship.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
78. My spouse/partner has been reluctant to give up household decisions.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

If you do not have children please skip the next two questions.

SINCE RETURNING FROM MY OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT:	Not at all true	Slightly true	Somewhat true	Very true	Completely true
79. I find my child(ren) have matured more than I expected.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
80. Relating to my child(ren) has been hard.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5
81. I feel my child(ren) resented my absence.	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA SHEET

1a. PERFORMING AGENCY DRDC Toronto	2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
1b. PUBLISHING AGENCY DRDC Toronto	

3. TITLE

(U) The development of a multidimensional measure of post-deployment reintegration: Initial psychometric analyses & descriptive results (Final report to Director General Health Services Quality of Life research grant)

4. AUTHORS

Blais, A.-R. Thompson, M.M. Febbraro, A Pickering, D. McCreary, D.

5. DATE OF PUBLICATION	6. NO. OF PAGES
December 1 , 2003	68

7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

8. SPONSORING/MONITORING/CONTRACTING/TASKING AGENCY
Sponsoring Agency:
Monitoring Agency:
Contracting Agency :
Tasking Agency:

9. ORIGINATORS DOCUMENT NO.	10. CONTRACT GRANT AND/OR PROJECT NO.	11. OTHER DOCUMENT NOS.
Technical Report TR 2003-142	16kg	

12. DOCUMENT RELEASABILITY

Unlimited distribution

13. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Unlimited announcement

14. ABSTRACT

(U) Returning home from overseas military service typically occurs within 24 hours. This abrupt return to "normal" roles and activities can be a significant stressor. To date, most information on the effects of post-deployment reintegration comes from American Vietnam War veterans suffering from PTSD, recalling their experiences years later. The present research is the first to develop a theoretically based, multidimensional, measure of post-deployment reintegration that reflects the experience of Canadian Forces soldiers. The measure, based on a review of the literature and discussions with CF personnel who have deployed, was constructed to reflect positive and negative aspects of four theoretical dimensions of reintegration: personal, family, occupational, and cultural reintegration. Three hundred and seventy-four CF veterans of Op Apollo in Afghanistan completed the initial Reintegration Survey. Exploratory factor analyses revealed both positive and negative aspects of the four dimensions of post-deployment reintegration. Overall, soldiers reported more positive than negative reintegration experiences. The most positive scores were associated with family and cultural reintegration, and the most negative scores were associated with work experiences. Some demographic group differences were associated with marital status, dependants, occupational group, and number of previous deployments.

(U) Le retour au pays après un service militaire accompli outre-mer se fait généralement en l'espace de 24 heures. Ce retour abrupt à la vie « normale » peut engendrer énormément de stress. Jusqu'ici, toutefois, la plupart des renseignements sur les effets de cette réintégration ont été obtenus auprès d'anciens combattants américains de la Guerre du Vietnam à qui l'on a demandé, des années plus tard, de se rappeler leur expérience du retour au pays. L'étude dont il est question ici est la première à avoir pour objet de mettre au point une mesure théorique et pluridimensionnelle de la réintégration postdéploiement, qui tiendrait compte de l'expérience des membres des Forces canadiennes. La mesure, fondée sur une analyse de la littérature et sur des discussions tenues avec des membres des FC ayant été déployés outre-mer, a été conçue de manière à rendre compte des aspects tant positifs que négatifs des quatre dimensions théoriques de la réintégration, soit les aspects personnel, familial, professionnel et culturel. Trois cent soixante-quatorze anciens combattants des FC ayant pris part à l'opération Apollo en Afghanistan ont répondu à la première version de l'enquête sur la réintégration. Les analyses des facteurs étudiés ont révélé que les quatre dimensions de la réintégration postdéploiement comportaient des aspects tant positifs que négatifs. Dans l'ensemble, les expériences positives signalées par les soldats l'emportaient sur les expériences négatives. Les scores positifs étaient surtout associés à la réintégration familiale et culturelle, et les scores négatifs, à la réintégration professionnelle. Certaines différences constatées entre les groupes étudiés étaient associées à l'état matrimonial, à la présence de personnes à charge, au groupe professionnel et au nombre de déploiements antérieurs.

15. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS

(U) post deployment reintegration; personal family occupational cultural reintegration; scale development; psychometric analyses; descriptive results